THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XI AUGUST, 1925 No. 62

EDITORIAL

To all those who knew Dr. Burge, the late Bishop of Oxford, the news of his death at the comparatively early age of sixty-two must have brought a very peculiar sorrow. Few men had a greater gift than he of understanding. In him sensitiveness and sympathy were tuned to an insight into the realities of men and of things, which made him beloved of his pupils, his friends, and his clergy alike. And behind it all was a life which belonged quite manifestly to "the heavenly places": so that whatever problem he touched was raised at once to the highest levels and set in the context of the pure and peaceable wisdom of God. We remember vividly one occasion—perhaps the only occasion—when he spoke in the Church Assembly. It was some three or four years ago, and the subject was Education. He spoke for no more than ten minutes. But it was one of those speeches which in a short time fulfilled a long. In a moment the Assembly was aware that it was listening to a master of the subject, and one to whom its spiritual issues were radiantly clear and of paramount significance. We do not recall ever listening to an utterance which more clearly revealed the ascendancy of the speaker.

At the recent anniversary meeting of the Anglo-Catholic Congress at the Albert Hall, the Chairman of the Committee, the Rev. C. R. Deakin, paid an affectionate tribute to the late Bishop of Oxford, and recalled the conference of bishops and priests which he gathered at Cuddesdon soon after the first Congress in 1920. One result of that conference was that the Bishop initiated the discussions which culminated in the appointment of the Archbishop's Commission on Christian Doctrine. Dr. Burge presided himself over its first two sessions, and none of the members can forget the atmosphere which he imparted

to the discussions. We doubt whether any of his services to the Church will prove to be of greater importance than his work in connection with this Commission. He realized that the real problem underlying the conflict of ideals and parties in the Church of England to-day is a problem of truth; and that no permanent progress towards reconstruction could be made until a synthesis had been sought and found on that plane. The task he envisaged, and which the Commission still envisages, is a large one, involving the examination of the whole system of doctrinal teaching in which the Church's mind is expressed; and many years must elapse before it is concluded. It would be well if those who talk lightly of impending disruption in the English Church would remember that the work of synthesis is being frankly faced by a body of representative thinkers, and that there is good hope of substantial results. For that hope we are indebted above all to Hubert Murray Burge. May he rest in peace.

The recent visit of the Eastern Patriarchs and Prelates for the purpose of joining in our Anglican commemoration of the Council of Nicæa is an event of great significance in our national and ecclesiastical history, and marks a definite advance towards the reunion of Christendom. Readers of the valuable series of articles in this journal which the Bishop of Gibraltar concludes to-day will have realized both the hopes and the difficulties inherent in the present situation of the Orthodox Churches. One of the most hopeful elements is the reaching out towards closer fellowship with the Church in other parts of the world. The work of the late W. J. Birkbeck, of Mr. Athelstan Riley, and of Canon Douglas, has indeed borne fruit. Above all, tribute is due to the patient and far-seeing statesmanship and the indomitable faith of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES—IV.

When one comes to deal in detail with the present state of the various Churches which make up Orthodox Christianity, their conditions are so dissimilar that few generalizations can be made. About the Russian Church, for instance, what can be said but words of sympathy and hope and intercession? And, again, the Œcumenical Patriarchate, confined now to Constantinople and all but desperately beset on every side, is in a position so special that it cannot be classed with other branches.

But when we come to the Balkan peninsula, in which dwells the great bulk of the Orthodox, Russia being set aside, we find a group of national Churches which, in spite of many *differentia*, have much in common. They are organized on the same lines, there is the strongest family resemblance in their liturgies and modes of worship, and as you enter the Churches, now of this country, now of that, it is like passing from one room to another in the same house—a house in every part of which the impress of one mind is clearly to be discerned. They have fought, though too rarely as a combined force, against the same foe; they have maintained the same Creed; they accept largely the authority of the same Fathers, recognize the decrees of the same Councils, and have preserved the same attitude towards the special doctrines and claims, as also towards the politics, of the Papacy.

Yet with all this, and more in common to make for unity and combined action, unity in act and fact cannot be said to exist between them, neither is there a living tradition of it. The influence of both nationalism and politics has all along been too strong, and especially in recent years has been paramount.

I suppose that if one had to study and pass judgment on nationalism from the Balkans alone, one would have to confess that it is a terrible curse to humanity. For its strongest characteristics there have been, not love of one's fatherland—patriotism—but contempt for, and dread and dislike of, surrounding peoples. Perhaps this is true of nationalism everywhere. A shrewd judge, a man with a deserved and world-wide reputation, urged upon me a few weeks ago that to-day nationalism is *the* enemy of peace all over the world. And if we may distinguish it from, and contrast it with, patriotism, his contention is sound; for then it is nothing more than the self-consciousness of a people feverish with xenophobia, and that is a condition which can only produce a foreign policy and an outlook on foreign relations which is a menace to peace.

Certainly, as an aftermath of the war, there is a great deal of this xenophobic nationalism all over the world. But whereas in the more settled nations its virulence is softened and qualified by counter-influences, in the less advanced countries it is apt to break out suddenly and carry men off their feet. This has been one of the main sources of trouble in the Balkans, though it is not, of course, a result of the late war. Rather, in this part of Europe it is inveterate and endemic, a direct result of conditions of life which have obtained for centuries. A Serb, for instance, will love Serbia, but the chief way in which that love—that vivid consciousness of nationality—has had to express itself has been in a constant attitude of active or expectant hostility to the nations all around. If not actively fighting, he is actively watching the frontiers with weapons ready and a mind attuned to war. Any peace, any alliance has always been precarious. The ally of to-day has so often proved the enemy of to-morrow. Thus they have lived in conditions which have developed nationalism rather than patriotism. And when that spirit has long animated three or four near neighbours which, for a variety of reasons, have been able to make comparatively little advance in the arts of peace and the achievements of commerce and industry and undisturbed order and security, the consequences are inevitable, and nationalism is an all but insurmountable barrier to any sort of external unity, especially with those near neighbours.

But nationalism directs politics, and particularly foreign policy. The State and its officials in such a group of nations would certainly view with alarm a rapprochement of any considerable organization of its nationals with similar organizations outside. A development of this sort must to some extent weaken, and might even seriously embarrass or defeat, the policy which the State might feel bound to call on its people to endorse. Above all would this danger loom great in a politician's eyes in connection with a national Church coterminous with the nation. Such a Church ought to be able to be relied on as an immense source of strength in hours of crisis and days of war. It should go far to ensure the enthusiasm and solidarity of the whole people in any great national effort; for it should imply that all the strength of supernatural sanctions and consolations and forces are marshalled in solid phalanx as a living power in the hour of need. But for this purpose the Church must stand clear of all entanglements and engagements with foreign Churches, above all with those from whom danger is most likely to arise. There might be grave peril in any ecclesiastical friendship or alliance with an external Church; so that the guardians of the national policy would look on it as their duty to prevent such

understandings, and the sentiment of nationalism would support them. So long, then, as the Church is controlled by the State, and its officials are appointed, paid, and removable by the State, the danger of the Church making serious efforts after understandings and alliances with neighbouring Churches will not be very serious. And these are broadly the facts of the case as regards unity and friendship between the national Churches of the Orthodox countries. Not so much through deliberate policy consciously promoted and efforced by the State, as by the natural effect of age-long conditions, a kind of nationalism and a trend of politics have come into being which have forced these Churches, in spite of all they have in common, far apart from one another, and conscious of very little desire to regard themselves as an acting working unity. If in the past the leadership of the Œcumenical Patriarchate could have been effectual, if under its presidency the national Churches could have met from time to time, the past, the present, and the future prospects of these nations would have been very different. But no action to express or give reality to their many varied sorts of oneness has taken place; and, therefore, though in the region of speculative theology the phrase "Orthodox Christianity" has meaning, and represents something, in the region of practice and fact it is still a goal to be reached. A great step towards this end would be taken if the present centenary year could be marked by the assembling of a unitive Council. Surely by now statesmen, not only in the countries directly affected, but of all peoples, must be able to perceive the importance of this measure, and should not merely see that no obstacles are allowed to prevent it, but that encouragement and facilities are given. How intensely needed such an approach to unity is can be proved by what takes place whenever, after a war, a new treaty causes a territorial change. Let us suppose that a portion of Bulgaria with villages and towns is transferred to Serbia. Immediately the stark effects of this nationalism are felt. The Bulgarian clergy, liturgy, language, schools, teachers are proscribed, and the corresponding Serbian agents and institutions are intruded, if need be by force. It would be precisely the same if Serbs were transferred to Bulgaria. Nor is there any ground or reason known to me for alleging that the Church is forced against its will to act in this unity-destroying fashion. Nationalism has so informed and dominated the national mind that it seems to all alike the right policy to pursue, and though those who are for the moment the "under-dog" make loud outcry and appeal, they know and will not deny that were positions reversed they would do exactly the same.

Yet I think we must emphasize the fact that this is due, not

to theological narrowness, but to nationalism and its politics. For this determination to silence and expel does not extend beyond the mutual dealings of the Orthodox Churches. Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Protestant missionaries are not persecuted or driven out. Strange sects from America send their agents, who preach freely and gather congregations unhindered. So that the inference that the intolerance of the branches of Orthodoxy to each other is not due to ecclesiastical bigotry is irresistible, and the truth appears plainly that if (say) the Serbian Church is proscribed and silenced in Bulgaria, it is not on theological grounds, but is a political measure. The Bulgar Church is a bulwark of Bulgar nationalism, and, as such, when a change of territory takes place, it must be firmly suppressed by Serbian nationalism. Whether this makes the goal of unity easier or harder to attain is a moot point, but we shall not make much progress in understanding what the issue actually is till we grasp the fact that the chief obstacle is nationalism.

Yet we may thankfully record our belief that in all these national Churches there are leaders who begin to see clearly that the intrusion of this political factor into the affairs of the Church is producing an ethos destructive of the very life of the Church, and that fundamental spiritual principles are being sacrificed to a policy which is not even astute. Judged by a politician according to his own standards, this way of treating a newly annexed territory appears to be a blunder. The reactions and resistances which it provokes make it a boomerang, the use of which any statesman will shun. But apart from all such prudential calculations, it is indisputable that while the Church can, and ought to, welcome patriotism as a sentiment which it should encourage, it can find no place for this nationalism, nor can it lend itself to the political practices to which it leads.

With these facts before us, the project of a Pan-Orthodox Council to be held during this year, or at least to be definitely decided on during this year, is a matter of far more than ecclesiastical or theological interest and importance. It is a project which, for instance, all who believe in the League of Nations, or take the higher view of political questions, ought to support vigorously. To substitute for a devastating nationalism a pure and wholesome patriotism is one of the world's great needs at the present moment, especially in the Balkans. And what step could produce this change so surely and rapidly as a Pan-Orthodox Council wisely led, and meeting before it is too late?

But there is one other matter on which I must touch, because without it any account of present conditions would be misleading.

Among the consequences of the war is the opening of the Balkan countries. It is not that before the war they were closed, as Japan once was by its own deliberate policy. Rather they were neglected, except by a few adventurous spirits who found their primitiveness alluring. The general idea was that here was a little group of nations still in the uninteresting condition of schoolboys. Their chief delight was to pommel one another, taking sides, not from policy, but from caprice, or "picking up," as for a scratch game, sides which would be dissolved as quickly and easily as they were created. There was no music, art, architecture, or culture to attract attention, no literature or history except for specialists; and though there was, no doubt, some fine scenery, there were no hotels for civilized people to stay in. And on their own side these nations were not eager to become full members of the European Society. If to the outsider their quarrels and politics seemed "schoolboyish," they themselves found their existence very grim and absorbing. More than half the time, too, they were looking with tense anxiety towards the East. Not Berlin, not even Vienna or St. Petersburg, still less Paris or London, but Constantinople focussed their attention.

Now all that is changed. The rest of Europe is very vividly aware of them, and they in turn of Europe. Nor is it only between them and Europe that a new day has dawned. America is aware of them, and the Y.M.C.A. and agricultural implements and strange enthusiastic religious bodies from "the States" have seen an almost virgin soil to be sown and reaped. And the Balkan peoples, among whom for this purpose I will include Roumania, have taken their own initiative as well. They are greatly in earnest about education, primary and secondary. The standard of life and knowledge is moving towards Western ideas. New thoughts and conceptions are in the air. The traditional and unquestioned beliefs, habits, scales of value, which all accepted and none challenged, are in the crucible. And the result is what only a thoughtful few, who probed deeply and really understood the conditions, would have expected, especially in matters which concern the Church and its life.

In the third decade of the twentieth century there comes suddenly on a group of national Churches, which up to now have lived apart, the accumulated result of all the changes in human thought which have accrued in the last hundred years, or even more.

It cannot be quite easy to pass, as many a Bulgarian farmer has passed, from the primitive wooden plough drawn by a donkey or a yoke of oxen to the Ford tractor. But think what it must mean to a village priest whose views of all cosmic laws,

and of God, nature, and man, were framed in the eleventh century, to find himself facing and trying to argue with a student who has just come back from a University in which the latest German or French education has been given to him. Or a theological student who, half-way through the old course, comes plump up against the new ideas. Or, again, some village or town which has gone on the old lines, and then finds itself invaded by a group of missionaries from America, who, Bible in hand, and with intense and fervent conviction, preach the immediate Second Coming, or Seventh-Day Adventism, or the views of the straitest of the Baptist sects. The impact of Wesley and Whitfield on our neglected miners does not begin to give an idea of the result, great as was the change it brought about. Yet it is through a whole series of such crises, which I can only faintly adumbrate, that Orthodox Christianity is now passing, and must needs pass. It does not, indeed, lack earnest and competent leaders, but will they have a free hand to act? is a question that one cannot but ask anxiously. Even if they are left free, they have a task of unimaginable difficulty. The gap between these leaders and the great bulk of clergy and people is so wide and deep that it is not easy to see how any leadership can bridge it quickly enough to meet the urgency of the need. A small army of men like the Friars, or even the best type of our own Church Army evangelists, men of fervour, trained to preach, lovers of souls, steeped in the message of the Gospel, and certain that in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments God speaks and manifests His very Presence, are what is needed; but the same causes which make the need so urgent make the creation and training of such a company very hard.

But, once again, how much could be achieved in regard to this crisis if only the Pan-Orthodox Council could meet! If these ancient Churches could assemble and show that they have lost no vigour of thought and will, that they still possess the spirit which meets a difficulty and faces a danger with wisdom and confidence, it would give a sorely needed reassurance of present power. While if, at the same time, they could prove themselves able and willing to reform what needs alteration, and to meet pressing problems created by new conditions with enlightened statesmanship, they would win a sure confidence that the foundations were sound; and it is this which gives men patience in critical days, and enables them to remain steadfast while the right solution of their difficulties is being worked out. A great mass of people does not think quickly and clearly; but its main perceptions are generally sound and profound. Instinctively it knows that it is usually much easier to state a problem than to solve it; to discover a grave defect in

corporate life than to remedy it. And so a people will wait with patience if it is sure that it is being capably and fearlessly led by men who obey true principles of action.

That Orthodox Christianity possesses such men, that a general Council of them would manifest Whom it is whose principles they obey, and that this more than anything else would change the grave danger of the present moment into a great opportunity for edifying the Church, would seem to be undeniable.

But the tide is rising fast, and while hasty action or anything that savours of panic would be fatal, there is no time to lose. Now—yes, now—not some years hence, is the moment for Orthodox Christianity to show itself as a "man well instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven, who brings forth out of his treasure things new and old."

JOHN GIBRALTAR.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC PILGRIMAGE

II

I HAVE written of our actual journey: I may now gather up a few threads which did not work easily into the chronological design of what I wrote. The pilgrimage to the Holy Land is, I believe, to be repeated next year, so I cannot begin better than by urging everyone who thinks of making it, and indeed everyone who desires to know something of the country, to read that work of genius, Sir George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. As a description of the physical features of the country it is a masterly introduction to travel: with the writer's eyes you learn to watch for the important geographical divisions, the changes of scenery and climate, which go so far to explain the history of the Holy Land, holy to men of diverse nations and languages. But geography is an arid study unless it is illuminated by history, and the book is an historical study of brilliancy and insight. I will not dwell on either aspect: I want to send as many readers as possible to this great book. I will merely mention the many varieties of Christianity in the land: (1) the Orthodox Eastern Church, with the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch; (2) the Roman Catholics, an Italian mission dating, for the most part, from the Western influences at the time of the Crusades, rigid and exclusive as in any part of the West to-day; (3) the Maronites, originally a Monothelite sect of the seventh century, but accepting the Roman supremacy in 1182, preserving many of their own customs, the marriage of priests, and the liturgy in the

Syriac tongue; they are practically confined to the Lebanon district, and have a fine cathedral at Beirut; (4) the Melchites, a gradual detachment from the Orthodox, chiefly in the seventeenth century, united to Rome, but preserving marriage of the clergy, communion in both kinds, and mass in the vulgar tongue; (5) the English Church, whose work is chiefly educational and confined to its own people, but is in most cordial relation with the Orthodox, and does not "make converts"; (6) various Protestant bodies too numerous to particularize here. Besides these there is a great mass of Muhammadans, beginning with the first conquest of the land by Islam, and reinforced by emigration, and political activity, and persecution. As to the future, I should like to quote Sir G. A. Smith:

"It is by a native Church, whose mother tongue is Arabic, that the Moslems will be reached, though we do not yet see whether this is to take place through the older bodies that give new evidence of new life, or through the new congregations of the Western missions. Meantime, two things are coming home to the Moslem; opportunities of education of a very high kind are within reach of all portions of the population, and even the Moslems of Damascus are waking up to the real meaning of Christianity through that side of her which represents perhaps more vividly than any other the Lord's own love and power to men—medical missions."

It is impossible but that a Christian pilgrim should look forward. The deepest impression made by the Holy Land is incontestably religious. The last Seatonian Prize poem (1924)* very impressively expresses this as its central thought: Jerusalem ordained of God to give to man the true religion of humanity, of service, and of worship. Even Pierre Loti, though he made but a "pélerinage sans foi," felt that, as a poet's heart must, supremely. Is it possible, he asks, that all these prayers should be heard of no one? Heart speaks to heart.† "Et je bénis fraternellement, pour ce peu de bien qu'ils m'ont fait, les humbles qui passent là devant moi, chuchotant dans les ténèbres leurs confiantes prières." The splendours of Jericho and of Tiberias have faded utterly away, and Solomon in all his glory is as forgotten as the cities of the plain, but the memory of the earthly life of Jesus Christ endures absolutely untouched on "those holy fields" which His feet have trod; and not only at the altar of Calvary, but all over the Holy Land, the cry goes up, "O crux, ave spes unica!"

---

* *Jerusalem*, by the Rev. Telford Varley. Cambridge University Press, 1925.
† *Jérusalem*, 23rd edition (1895), p. 93.

For the preservation of these sacred memories not only religion, but archæology, has laboured with conspicuous success. The Palestine Text Society and the Palestine Exploration Fund supplement the work of purely Biblical scholars, at the head of whom is Sir George Adam Smith. The late and much-lamented Dr. C. F. Burney wrote an illuminating article on Ancient Jerusalem in the *Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1910, and later, notably in 1923-24, discoveries have thrown still further light on the early history of the city itself. The pilgrim must be unintelligent indeed who is not attracted by the writings of the archæologists. The Byzantine Research Fund volume on the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem* may be mentioned as a conspicuous example of illuminative work, and from it, after a study of the church, with the book in my mind, on the spot, I am more than ever disposed to emphasize the words of the Bishop of Gloucester, which I will take leave to quote here. They should be borne in mind by every historical or archæological student who visits the Holy Places of Syria and Palestine. He mentions the evidence of Origen and of Justin Martyr as to the site of the Nativity, and that of St. Jerome as to the pollution of the Holy Places, and adds: "The testimony as to the desecration of the sacred sites in Palestine has a double importance. It proves that they were already identified and revered before the time of Hadrian, and it provided the evidence for the identification of the site [of the Nativity] in the time of Constantine. In the case of the cave at Bethlehem, the evidence of Justin and Origen is thus corroborated. . . . There is every reason to believe that early in the second century the cave in Bethlehem was shown as the place of the birth of our Lord, that the very means taken by Hadrian to pollute this as other sacred spots perpetuated the tradition, that this cave was pointed out in the middle of the third century when Origen wrote, and that Helena, when she wished to build a church on the holy site, would have no difficulty in identifying the site."

To the archæologist the Pilgrimage of 1925 was of great interest. At Alexandria the Mole itself, which Strabo mentions, has done much to give its special features to the modern city; and "Pompey's pillar" looks back, no doubt, to a still greater antiquity. Strabo, again, describes Jericho to us, with its palm grove and garden of balsam (these have entirely disappeared), and he gives a vivid description of the neighbourhood of the Red Sea. Everything has changed; but I can see no reason why the country should not become beautiful again, and the Dead Sea become a "watering place," invaluable to rheumatic patients.

* *The Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem*, by W. Harvey, W. R. Lethaby, O. M. Dalton, H. A. A. Cruso, and A. C. Headlam. London, 1910.

Nazareth already seems something like a health resort, and so, surely, could Tiberias become, and Capernaum, and Cana. In each case the archæologists should help us. But to the great cities belongs a continuous life. It must not be thought that Jerusalem has entirely changed in the last century. Personally, I simply do not notice that there are trams and electric light: they seem to me just as much a part of the time we live in, and look at the past from, as trousers or drains are. And really these Eastern places change, I feel inclined to say, less rapidly than London or Oxford does. When the Easterns see a beautiful or an old building, they do not really say, "Let us pull it down": they allow the Walls, or the Church of the Studion, at Constantinople, to fall into decay, but they do not often destroy buildings. It is too much trouble. I have a collection of extremely pretty coloured prints of Jerusalem, done, I suppose, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and of most of them I found the original quite easily when I was in the Holy City. A wall and tower, trees, of course, growing on the top: that is on one's way to the Holy Sepulchre. The pool of Bethesda: that I did not see, but it is just like a larger pool of Hezekiah. The tomb of Rachel: yes, rather less of it than then, but still goats and sheep and donkeys about. A street in Bethlehem: quite untouched. The tomb of Absalom: that I did not see, but a soldier who had seen it in the war recognized it at once in my house. And the general view, with the great domes, is hardly changed, save that it is more thickly built over. Yes, no one who goes to the Holy Land need fear that it is so modernized as to take away the sentiment of the glorious past. The well at Nazareth and the well at Sychar remain to reject such a supposition.

Yet year by year the excavations enable us to trace the history of the Holy Land, and Jerusalem itself, farther back. We know now where was David's city, and which is "the hill of Zion which he loved," the fort of the Jebusites which David captured, even the meeting-place of Abraham and Melchizedek. Beside these discoveries the Crusaders' days seem modern history: the remains of their churches (the Holy Sepulchre itself is among them) and castles and city walls are everywhere to be seen. Go northwards by the sea, and Sidon has revealed the most beautiful and perfect ancient sarcophagus in the world, the "tomb of Alexander," which is to be seen in the museum at Constantinople. We were more of archæologists at Constantinople than pilgrims: so we were at Naples and Pompeii. The walls of the first still remain, but precariously: more precarious still are the great cracks in the dome of St. Sophia. In vain did Sir Thomas Jackson a few years ago report immediate

danger. It certainly seems to-day as if the most famous church in Europe would soon be a ruin if Europe does not step in and save it from the Turks. In that glorious city the architectural history of the dome can be traced: St. Sergius and St. Bacchus stands still practically unharmed to show how St. Sophia was prepared for. Basilicas still seem almost unaltered: St. John of the Studium, alas, is rapidly becoming an irretrievable ruin, but the great mosque of Damascus is only one of many in the East where the Roman tradition survives unharmed. Walid, the builder of the great mosque at Damascus, designed his basilica in the form of a parallelogram, but a Roman basilica it is, nevertheless: so are many of the mosques at Constantinople. At Bethlehem is a pure basilica with a dome and chapels added. The only original feature of Moslem architecture seems to be the horse-shoe arch. For the greater part of our travels we were among monuments which are almost hackneyed to architects, but some buildings, such, perhaps, as the chapel of St. Helena, or that of the Virgin's tomb at Jerusalem, have hardly received the attention they deserve. Familiar, indeed, to students of architecture, but not so well known to "the general public" are the magnificent ruins of Baalbek, and also, as regards the latest discoveries, those of Pompeii. At the latter, new houses, even new streets, are constantly being unearthed; there are still huge heaps of ashes to be dissected, but already there is, in a state in which the eye can reconstruct it entire, a Roman city of the first century A.D. At Baalbek also the discoveries progress, and we are able to understand much of the general scheme—though one may distrust the French archæologists' conjectural restoration—of temples than which there can be none finer in the world. Of Athens it would ill befit any but a professed Greek archæologist to speak; the Acropolis and the Parthenon, though still new discoveries are being made, are fixed in the knowledge of educated Europe. These are world-famed places; but there are others you may get but a glimpse of, and yet be sure you will never forget, such as the temple of Poseidon on Cape Sunion (Kolonaaes), later, no doubt, than the Theseion and the Parthenon, but not unworthy to be compared with them. Archæologists are at work in Cyprus; where are they not? There is plenty for the historical student to discover in Patmos; and Malta is a glorious storehouse of history, art, and romance, where the history of the Knights —if nothing else—needs writing from the original documents which exist in such abundance. I never can help regretting that we are not allowed to see the beginnings of the romance which the greatest of British romantic writers wrote about that romantic land. But Lockhart knew best. (At

the very moment when I took up my pen to resume this article here I received three most valuable historical monographs by Signor Hannibal Scicluna, the Librarian of the National Library, Malta, on different points of the history of the island.)

There was, for all who take any pleasure in history and archæology, continual opportunity for learning; but the pilgrimage was, of course, primarily a popular one—a journey, like that in the *Canterbury Tales*, of quite ordinary folk like myself. Yet we had also scholars really acquainted with the history and liturgies of the Churches, such as Fr. Fynes-Clinton; and one scholar of great ability and fluency in Canon J. A. Douglas, who translated our English to patriarchs and prelates and their replies, in whatever tongue, to us. Though Bishop Wakefield spoke French (and, when need be, German) with great tact and charm, always saying "the right thing," it was Canon Douglas on whom we had to depend when we conversed with Orientals. He took them and us alike under his wing, and made us all happy together. He also instructed us cogently and often in the things we ought to see and do and say. The University of Athens has a doctor's degree waiting for him, and the Patriarch of Jerusalem recognized his learning by conferring the cross of the Order of the Holy Sepulchre. There was certainly a distinct "social" side to this pilgrimage. The members of the committee devoted their social gifts to ensuring its success. They saw that one way to the hearts of Orientals was through social entertainment. Thus, at (I think) each stopping place dinners (quaintly called "banquets" on the notices) were given by the committee, and one at Jerusalem by Sir Henry Lunn. At these eloquent orations were delivered by our orators, and undoubtedly prelates and professors (as at Athens) appreciated the courtesy. In recognition of this the Patriarch of Jerusalem conferred on two of the committee, Fr. Whittingham and Fr. Child, the cross of the Order of the Holy Sepulchre.

Our hospitality was, of course, anticipated by that of our hosts. Patriarchs and Archbishops gave us "refreshments" when we went to see them; the Patriarch of Jerusalem a delightful book of photographs and pressed flowers; and the Patriarch of Antioch an English translation of the Offices of his Church. At Athens we had a delightful tea—a real tea it was—with the Archbishop of Athens.

Still, in spite of all politeness, I wonder if we anywhere created quite the impression of tidiness and calm which an Englishman hopes belong to him. Only the committee managed to have very clean and appropriate garments for every

occasion; but then, on the other hand, some of them deeply shocked some of the Eastern clergy (who are extremely careful always to dress in their clerical habit, and, like the French and the Spaniards, suspect a priest who wears lay clothes as intending —to use familiar words of Dean R. W. Randall—"to do something disgraceful") by wearing light clothes of lay cut, with soft hats, collars, and coloured ties in the daytime, and at night the evening garb peculiar to Roman Catholic clergy: one is not sure which disturbed our Oriental friends most! But how could one endure stiff black in that heat? And as for gaiters, they, for me at least, ceased to exist.

I believe some were afraid that an Anglo-Catholic pilgrimage might cause a political stir. It did nothing of the kind. No one took any of us for Lord Balfour, or thought that we had come to disturb any governmental system. At Cyprus the enthusiastic prelates and other orators managed to introduce an expression of their fervent desire for union with Greece. At Patmos, no doubt, the same feeling was very much more deeply felt, and was certainly hinted at; against our will we were no doubt regarded as sympathizers. At Constantinople we were especially warned not to visit the Armenians or the Orthodox patriarchate for fear that the Turks might make this a pretext for further persecution. Knowing the Turks for the last thirty years, I carefully obeyed this advice, and denied myself the privilege of again worshipping at the Patriarchal Church in the Phanar; but I believe other members of the pilgrimage did go there, I earnestly hope with no ill results. Dr. Douglas paid a special visit to the Patriarch Meletios when we were at Athens. I believe the Patriarch, whose personal position is dangerously complicated with politics, has since resigned his office. The visits we paid to refugees were certainly not political. We saw many small camps and shanties tenanted by these unhappy people, and on our ship were many hoping to find a home and work in America. I mention this because I want to ask everyone who possibly can to help the Greeks, who are nobly doing their very utmost to succour the banished Christians and the Save the Children Fund. Its sensational placards are not in the least exaggerated. Non-political though our purpose was, we could not help noticing obvious facts of the present situation, such as that the great quay of Smyrna is still one mass of ruins, that there is not a quarter of the shipping in the Golden Horn that there was twenty years ago, and that the harbour of the Piræus is crowded to its fullest capacity and beyond.

These things no traveller can fail to see and to think about. But whatever may have been the subsidiary attractions for

many, it would be cruel to fancy that Religion was not the first thought of all: to see where our Lord was born, and died, and rose again; to follow His steps on earth and the steps of His holy Apostles; to go back into the dim past and see where the prophets and the patriarchs and kings heard God speaking to them, whether they would hear or whether they would forbear. And I believe that to many on this pilgrimage in the Holy Land there came irresistibly a thought almost new. In the words we sang so often at evensong:

> "Where'er we seek the Holy Child,
> At every sacred spot,
> We meet the Mother undefiled,
> Who shun her seek Him not;
> At cloistered Nazareth we see,
> At haunted Bethlehem
> The Throne of Jesus, Mary's knee,
> Her smile, His diadem."

The worship of our Lord in the land of His birth took on a new tinge of devotion, it seemed, through the memory of His Mother.

Every day the Holy Sacrifice was offered, many times in the early morning. After the saloon was given up to the other passengers, we had our different services for the most part on deck, and the hymns rang out exultantly over the sea. More than once Dr. Russell Wakefield spoke to us with a fatherly and appealing simplicity. Father Cornibeer and Father Fynes-Clinton were our chaplains, most devoted in all their duties and most helpful to us all. And one day, the eve of the Ascension, we spent as—perhaps hardly a Retreat, but certainly a Quiet Day. It was conducted by Father Cornibeer. To all of us who took part in it it gave intense happiness, and it helped us to garner and treasure the memories of the Holy Places we had seen.

So let me end these random memories of a rapid pilgrimage. If they encourage others to go, I shall be very glad; but at least they may help to preserve for myself some very holy and happy memories.

W. H. Hutton.

FOUR CASES OF CONSCIENCE—II.

2. Confession of Mortal Sin before Communion.—It has long been agreed that mortal sin (in technical language) deprives the soul of the "state of grace"; and that it is a sin to approach the "sacraments of the living" other than in a state of grace.* In regard to the other sacraments, this "state"

* Alph. Lig., *Theol. Mor.*, vi. 83, and commonly.

can be regained by "perfect contrition"; but as regards the Eucharist, it is a rule of the Roman obedience that sacramental confession is necessary as well.* A Christian, therefore, who came to receive Communion after committing mortal sin, but without receiving sacramental absolution, would necessarily be guilty of further (mortal) sin; and if he persisted in the practice, would have to be refused absolution. But a penitent in similar case in the Church of England might possibly say: "I am aware that from time to time I commit sins worthy of the name 'mortal,' but I am convinced that the contrition I elicit thereafter is enough to restore me to the state of grace necessary to Holy Communion. I cannot therefore conscientiously recognize as binding any rule which requires me to make my confession after each mortal sin before presenting myself for Communion." What is an Anglican confessor to answer?

If the rule requiring sacramental confession as a necessary preliminary, after mortal sin, to the reception of Holy Communion be regarded, as far as the Anglican body is concerned, as at most an ecclesiastical enactment of a bygone age,† now fallen into disuse, this case becomes identical with the last. But a number of Roman Catholic authorities regard it as obligatory of divine right,‡ and therefore as intimately bound up with the possibility of human salvation;§ and this is partly borne out by the doctrine that not even the Pope can dispense from it. It is true that Azpilcueta and Caietan, among ancient authorities, and Noldin among moderns, deny this; and their denial has never been condemned. Even in the Roman communion, therefore, it cannot be called a universal opinion. The general disregard of the requirement by canonical authority in the Anglican body would appear, moreover, to make the opinion, that it has never been more than an ecclesiastical enactment, morally certain for English Churchmen. A confessor who took this view would therefore be right in giving absolution to a penitent who refused in all good faith to recognize the principle as binding upon himself by virtue of its original promulgation, and saw no other obligation in conscience to adopt it.

If, however, the confessor were unable to regard the opinion

* Conc. Trid., *Sess.* xiii., *Decret.*, c. 7; *Can.* 11 (Denz.-Bann., Nos. 880, 893), based on 1 Cor. xi. 28; thereafter commonly.

† *E.g.*, for the English Church, *Lib. Leg. Eccles.*, ascr. Theodulph., A.D. 994 (c. 44, Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 281); Council of Eynsham, A.D. 1009 (Can. 17, *ib.*, i. 289); Council of Durham, A.D. 1220 (*ib.*, i. 577); Const. of Abp. Peckham, 1281 (c. 1, *ib.*, ii. 52).

‡ So Alph. Lig., *op. cit.*, vi., § 256, and authors there quoted. *Cf.* Prümmer, *Theol. Mor.*, iii., pp. 140, 141.

§ Tanquerey, *Theol. Mor.*, ii. 131-151: "Lex evangelica complectitur . . . præcepta quæ servare necesse est ut vitam æternam consequamur."

that the rule is not of divine precept as more than "probable," several factors would have to be taken into account before his duty could clearly be determined. Thus (*a*) while it is commonly agreed that a "probable opinion" may be followed in cases of doubt* (this rule being merely a variation of the wider principle, *lex dubia non obligat*), the application of the rule has come as the result of experience to be restricted within very definite limits. The probability must at least be a genuine and serious one, based on solid arguments. There must clearly be no danger of scandal resulting from non-conformity. But, further, it is the unanimous opinion of responsible casuists that the principle may not be employed in the interests of freedom if the matter at stake is "an end which has to be secured"—*i.e.*, if it affects the immediate issues of life, death, salvation, or the undoubted rights of others. This limitation is obviously wholesome. In a matter of life or death, for example, it would clearly be immoral to say, "Though I recognize frankly that in all normal cases obedience to this principle is absolutely imperative, and cannot prove that it is not so in the present case; yet because I think it probable that the present case is abnormal, I propose on this occasion to ignore the principle."

(*b*) Wherever, then, we find it impossible to deny that such and such a principle, apparently essential to salvation, is relevant (even though it is impossible also to affirm it), conformity to the principle in question would at first sight appear obligatory; and the confessor would seem morally bound to refuse absolution wherever conformity were not forthcoming. It might, however, be suggested that this application of our rule, however valid for the Church of Rome, is beside the mark for the Church of England. In a fully elaborated ecclesiastical system the confessor's responsibility is greatly lessened by decisions, instructions, and reservations of superior authority. In the Anglican communion little, if any, help of this kind is extended by canonical authority. From this apparent unwillingness of the Church to give any indication to her ministers as to the cases (if any) in which she would have them refuse absolution, it might with some reason be inferred that she is prepared to tolerate conscientious non-conformity to an almost unlimited degree, and that her confessors have no right to refuse absolution in any types of case as to which the Church has not definitely enjoined them to do so, except, of course, those in which the penitent persists in a course of action plainly violating his own conscience. The cogency of this argument, which is

* *Supra*, p. 31. Not to admit this principle would involve us in the completely rigorist position, that any and every "law," however trivial, must be obeyed, even in cases where its applicability is patently doubtful.

not indeed wholly inapplicable even to the more fully developed system of the Church of Rome, is greatly enhanced for Anglicans by the fact that their communion obviously tolerates abstention from sacramental confession on the part of any of her members who do not feel called to the practice. Such tolerance would seem equivalent to the renunciation of any desire to restrict or regulate the dictates of the individual conscience, as distinct from the correction of excesses *in foro externo*.

(*c*) Attractive and easy though this conclusion appears to be, we must yet hesitate before adopting it. If the principles adduced in a preceding paragraph are valid in particular problems of doubtful obligation, they must also be valid on this wider issue. The argument undoubtedly establishes a genuine doubt as to whether the Church intends her confessors to refrain from absolving conscientious penitents in any type of case as to which she has not issued definite instructions. But the matter in debate is obviously one of vital importance to the Church; it concerns her whole existence as a disciplined and organized body; it is, we may say, an issue in which a "certain end has to be secured." We are confronted, therefore, with just another instance of the general rule that the benefit of the doubt may not be taken or assumed when matters of vital importance are at stake. If this be true, it would appear that the confessor may not assume a general liberty to absolve in all cases that arise, even on grounds of conscientiousness, unless and until the Church or his own conscience assures him that such a liberty is undoubtedly his. Till that assurance is given he is bound to consider each problem on its own merits.

(*d*) And in the present problem, the confessor who cannot persuade himself that the law of confession before Communion is wholly irrelevant to the issue of salvation is clearly faced with a doubt in a matter of vital importance. The problem involves the conditions of worthy approach to the central Christian sacrament. "I cannot agree," he might well say, "that you have made such preparation for receiving the sacrament as the law of reverence demands, if—after conscious mortal sin—you have failed to add sacramental confession to such repentance as in other ways you have shown. And voluntary irreverence in such a matter must surely jeopardize your hope of salvation—it is the adoption of an attitude towards God, in other words, which undermines the foundations of the whole moral life." We need not stop either to justify or to rebut such a position; but we must recognize that at first sight it would appear to make it imperative for any confessor who held it to insist upon conformity as a condition of absolution.

(*e*) On second thoughts, however, this conclusion does not appear to be justified. Where the whole weight of authority and practice in a particular communion, together with a not inconsiderable body of expert opinion tolerated in another and important communion, upholds the belief that a given principle is not in itself essential in all cases to salvation, it would seem to require more than mere uncertainty in the confessor's mind to constitute even as much as a valid doubt in the contrary direction. To set oneself in such a matter against the tacit view (at least) of one's ecclesiastical superiors, the recognized principles of one's Church, and a serious and tolerated opinion among other Christians, and thereupon to deny the sacrament to a penitent who is, on all human evidence, "rightly disposed," is to assume a responsibility which no mere hesitation, but only the weightiest arguments, if not the most absolute conviction, can ever justify.* We need not for a moment deny the existence of absolute moral standards of such importance that their observance might well be regarded as "essential to salvation"; nor is it inconceivable that a list of principles might be drawn up which all Christians of every generation would recognize as possessing this absolute and necessary character. But it is a very different matter to hold that *all* principles which have by any given generation or particular branch of the Church been brought under this category, even with good reasons, are so universally binding that every intentional breach of them must be regarded as putting a man effectively outside the Christian pale; or to assume that *other* principles, which many sober men cannot recognize as binding, in some if not the majority of cases, can lightly be brought under the same head. Yet one or other of such assumptions would appear to be made by the confessor who, in the case under consideration, refuses to give absolution.

In a matter such as the present one, the onus of proof would seem to lie with those who assert that observance of the principle is universally essential to salvation, rather than with their opponents. If this were not so, our rule that in matters affecting salvation the safer course (that of conformity to any law which could conceivably be regarded as bearing upon man's "last end") must always be followed, even though the balance of probability lies against the supposition of its necessity, would constitute an intolerable burden to conscience. Any weighty theologian would be free to assert that a given principle were of such a character, and thereafter the contrary opinion could never be regarded as more than the "more probable," so that

* Notice a similar warning in Alph. Lig., i., § 97, with references to Aquinas, Scotus, etc.

the principle thus stated would at once and *ipso facto* become binding in conscience upon all men until explicitly condemned by the Church.* The Roman communion evades this difficulty, in the matter in question, by asserting that (whether confession before Communion be a divine precept or not) it is certainly a grave obligation upon the Christian by reason of the decision of the Council of Trent.† The Anglican has not at present any similar safety-valve. He must therefore take refuge in what appears to be a perfectly justifiable conclusion—that, in default of explicit ecclesiastical pronouncement or its equivalent in recognized custom, whatever is not commonly regarded by the vast majority of serious-minded Christians as necessary in itself *in all cases* to salvation, may not so be regarded by any Christian, unless he is led to this conclusion by a conscientious conviction of absolutely compelling force; nor can any doubts or hesitations he may have upon the point justify him in refusing the benefit of the doubt to a fellow-Christian.

3. "Birth Control."—Practices analogous to the modern use of contraceptives (*venena sterilitatis*) were condemned as long ago as St. Augustine's time; and the condemnation is repeatedly enforced—*e.g.*, by Peter Lombard.‡ Excuses such as those of the danger attending another confinement, or the necessity of limiting the number of children consequent upon the stringency of small incomes, were known and disallowed at least as early as the fifteenth century.§ It cannot, therefore, fairly be urged that "modern conditions," merely by their novelty or greater urgency, necessitate a reconsideration of the problem. St. Thomas gave a clear statement of principle on which the condemnation both of *coitus interruptus* and of the use of contraceptives can be based, and regarded the principle involved as pertaining unequivocally to the "natural law."‖ In the Roman communion this principle has apparently been wholly unchallenged; the condemnation of both forms of "birth control" has been repeatedly reiterated in the nineteenth century; and the duty of teaching against it repeatedly imposed upon parish priests and confessors.¶ Of the Church of England it can apparently be said that the principle has equally gone unchallenged until recent times; whilst the 252 Bishops of the Anglican communion gathered at Lambeth in 1920 reaffirmed

* A similar argument is used against tutiorism as such by Navarrus, *in comm.*, d. 7, *de pœn.*, c. 4, 8.

† Prümmer, *op. cit.*, iii. 141.

‡ Aug., *De nupt. et con.*, i. 15; Pet. Lomb., *Sent.*, iv., d. 31.

§ Gabriel Biel (+ 1495), *Summ. in Sent.*, iv., d. 31, q. 1.

‖ *C. Gent.*, iii. 122; *S.T.*, ii. 2, q. 154, a. 1.

¶ Replies of S. Off., May 21, 1851; April 19, 1853; March 30, 1889; of S. Pen., March 10, 1886; November 13, 1901; September 2, 1904.

it in terms almost, if not quite, unequivocal.* On the other hand, no one in responsible authority has apparently said anything which could be taken as in any way denying the supreme importance of the principle. It would therefore appear that in this matter the weight of probability is heavily on the side of one who urges that *here*, if anywhere, is a principle which the Church of England recognizes as wholly obligatory, though perhaps not absolutely committing herself to the position that it is obligatory because it is a law of nature. A confessor who took this point of view would be in duty bound to refuse absolution to a penitent who, however conscientiously, declared himself unwilling to abandon practices of the character indicated; and no extenuating circumstances, however distressing or urgent, could avail in any given case to alter his duty.

It is not necessary for us to consider the arguments for or against the legitimacy of "birth control" for the Christian; our problem is to solve the confessor's difficulty created by the present uncertainty on the subject. For there is some uncertainty, as may be gathered from the traces of ambiguity discernible even in the weighty pronouncement of the Bishops at Lambeth;† from the relative silence of Anglican authority since that pronouncement—a silence all the more remarkable in view of the heated discussions, in the Press and elsewhere, of the

* Resolution 68 reads: "The conference, while declining to lay down rules which will meet the needs of every abnormal case, regards with grave concern the spread in modern society of theories and practices hostile to the family. We utter an emphatic warning against the use of unnatural means for the avoidance of conception, together with the grave dangers—physical, moral, and religious—thereby incurred, and against the evils with which the extension of such use threatens the race. In opposition to the teaching which, under the name of science and religion, encourages people in the deliberate cultivation of sexual union as an end in itself, we steadfastly uphold what must always be regarded as the governing considerations of Christian marriage. One is the primary purpose for which marriage exists—namely, the continuation of the race through the gift and heritage of children; the other is the paramount importance in married life of deliberate and thoughtful self-control. We desire solemnly to commend what we have said to Christian people and to all who will hear" (*Report*, p. 44).

† Points of ambiguity and difficulty about the Resolution are as follows: (*a*) It is not referred to in the parallel passage of the encyclical letter (*Report*, pp. 17, 18); (*b*) "declining to lay down rules for every abnormal case" opens up a wide field of uncertainty; (*c*) "we utter an emphatic warning . . . we desire solemnly to commend . . ." suggest that the Resolution is more by way of a thesis for serious consideration than an ecclesiastical ruling; (*d*) "unnatural means" introduces the very difficult problem of finding a criterion by which to discriminate between "natural" and "unnatural"; (*e*) the teaching opposed is only that which makes "sexual union an end in itself"; (*f*) no distinction is drawn between the "dangers and evils" attaching to the use of these "means" for the avoidance of child-birth altogether, and their use only after the birth of several children—an omission so remarkable as to suggest that cases of the latter kind may be of the "abnormal" type for which the conference declined to make any rules; (*g*) the phrase "governing considerations" is very vague. Still, the general tenor of the Resolution is clear, and it is significant that it does not contain the phrase used in the Report of the Committee on which it was based: "we are aware that many persons of undoubted sincerity, whose opinions are entitled to respect, do not share this view."

last five years; and from the genuine questionings of serious-minded Christians conscious of the real difficulties of the matter. All these facts could be taken as evidence that the Church of England, while fully recognizing the sinfulness of refusing to have children through mere love of comfort or the like, is not wholly committed to the absolute condemnation of "birth control" in every case.

In face, however, of the arguments adduced in the previous paragraph, such a view could not be regarded as more than, at best, a reasonable doubt; and the matter being one which the vast majority of Western Christians regards as essential to salvation, the doubt would not at present justify a confessor who held it in giving absolution. If, however, our authorities did not avail themselves of obvious opportunities of reiterating the principle during, say, the next generation, whilst the feeling, on the part of seriously minded Christians, in favour of relaxation grew, the confessor would be in a position somewhat analogous to the last case. The duty of proving the principle to be of essential obligation would then lie with him, and would have to be discharged before he could be regarded as obliged to refuse absolution in all cases. Such a contingency may very well arise; it cannot be said to be the case at present.

Only, therefore, if a confessor is, after full consideration, possessed by the conscientious conviction (as distinct from a mere doubt or probable opinion) that the principle in question is not in every case obligatory to salvation, will he be justified in considering the possibility of giving absolution in such cases. Nor will he be immediately free to absolve, even after deciding that the principle does not oblige to conformity in any given case, until he has considered a further point. It is true that an obviously irrelevant or unjust law does not demand conformity in itself, but, as St. Thomas wisely observes,* it may yet be a duty for the Christian to "waive his right," "to avoid scandal and perturbation"—to conform (as we may say) in deference to the weaker brother's conscience. If, then, a confessor held that, in the abstract, a given couple who had fulfilled their duty to the race by producing children might reasonably be condoned in the use of contraceptives, he would still have to ask whether the social effect of such permissions, by giving excuse to others to adopt the methods in question for selfish or immoral purposes, would not be so disastrous as to make conformity even in this case a duty. Only if this argument from social effects had no weight with him, or if, on balance, he saw worse effects coming from the refusal of absolution in what may be called genuine cases, would he be free to absolve.

* *S.T.*, i. 2, q. 96, a. 4; quoting St. Matt. v. 40, 41.

In such an event, however, he would be free; and, further, it would be his duty to give absolution, at all events where it appeared certain that the penitent also was guided by a strong and genuine sense of duty, and was clearly of a category in regard to which the confessor could say without hesitation that the principle did not in itself oblige to salvation. In so doing the confessor would simply be following the clear dictates of his own conscience, which every man is bound to do.

But a further question arises. Would the confessor, who in this way acted upon a conviction contrary to what he recognized to be the general opinion of his Church, be bound to inform his Bishop that he was giving absolution in such cases? The deliberate and consistent practice of the Church of England appears to be to leave the decision of when and when not to absolve wholly to the discretion of the individual confessor. Even the practice of encouraging recourse to dispensation has fallen into almost complete disuse. There would seem, therefore, at first sight to be no duty laid upon the confessor of disclosing to the Bishop his practice in the matter, even though he believes that practice to be contrary to the general conscience of the Church.

Yet the analogy even of human societies suggests that the contrary answer is the true one. However free a hand an administrative official is given, he is still no more than an official. It would seem to be his moral duty, if he contemplates a course of action which he suspects to be at variance with the governing sentiments of the society for which he acts, to give that society some formal opportunity for expressing an opinion upon his policy or action. And in the present case it is clear, in addition, that if the confessor were convinced (as we assumed him to be) that the statement, "Abstention from birth control is in all cases necessary to salvation," is a statement radically untrue to the highest principles of Christianity, he would probably be doing less than his duty in the matter if he allowed this belief to show itself only when actually called upon to absolve. On both these grounds, therefore, it might reasonably be held that he ought to testify to his conviction by informing his Bishop, not so much that he was absolving in cases of the kind, as that he held convictions of the kind mentioned, and proposed not merely to act upon them in the confessional, but also to express them publicly on all suitable occasions.

4. Heretical Opinions.—The principles which dominated the last case operate with even greater clearness here. If the penitent seriously maintained views on matters of faith plainly contradictory of the primary truths of Christianity, the confessor would be bound to refuse absolution (however conscien-

tious the "heresy" might be) unless he himself were profoundly convinced that the Church was in complete and serious error in the matter. In the latter case he would be bound to reveal his view to the Bishop, for the reasons already given; but not necessarily to declare it in confession, as he could not regard himself as being in mortal sin on the point.

Difficulty arises, however, in the definition of "heretical opinions." They would clearly have to be more than "opinions"; if they were simply doubts or hesitations which the penitent were genuinely trying to resolve, they could not possibly be regarded as sins, but, at best, as temptations only. If, again, they took the form of asserting that the Virgin Birth, for example, was not or could not be "proved," they would not be heretical; for no "truth of faith" is either "proved" or "provable."* If the penitent said, "I cannot believe the doctrine of the Virgin Birth," his case would be distressing; but so long as he were able to add, "I would gladly do so if I could," he would have to be regarded as *rite dispositus*. Nothing short of the statement, "I am wholly and absolutely convinced that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, in any and all of the senses in which it has ever been, or might ever be, understood and tolerated by the Church, is flatly untrue, and I therefore repudiate it *in toto*," would seem to constitute genuine heresy. No doubt if a Christian alleged that a particular formula, condemned by the universal Church, or by his own branch of the Church, as heretical, were true *in exactly that sense in which the Church understood it at the moment of its condemnation*, he would be guilty of heresy; but such a case is difficult to conceive.† No doubt, also, if he insisted upon using phrases whose use the Church had condemned and still forbade, or upon asserting that such and such an interpretation, upheld by current ecclesiastical authority, of a particular doctrine, in the exact sense in which that authority intended it to be taken, were untrue, it would be necessary to refuse absolution; but the "sin" in such cases would not be that of heresy so much as that of "formal contempt." There are, of course, many such problems of conscience arising in the matter of faith into which we cannot enter here. Our conclusion on the present issue must simply be, that to withhold absolution on the grounds of "heresy" alone can be a duty for the Anglican confessor only in the rarest possible cases.

K. E. Kirk.

* So Aquinas constantly, and all others.

† The only instance of a formula being repudiated, not only in itself, but *also in the sense intended by its author* (without any attempt to define that "sense"), is the condemnation of the five propositions of Jansen by Alexander VII. (Denz-Bann., 1098, 1099).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION OF OUR LORD

Among the changes made in the Revised Lectionary which we have recently been authorized to use is the elevation of the Festival of the Transfiguration of our Lord on August 6 to the rank of a Red Letter Day. This step suggests that the present is a fitting moment to reopen the study of the event with a view to determine how far the revisers of the Lectionary are justified in making the change.

The Transfiguration is an incident in our Lord's life of no common interest. It is so exceptional in its character, so singular in its circumstances, that it possesses a fascination peculiar to itself. The accepted comments on it are unsatisfying. They leave it standing alone, and offer no adequate reason for its occurrence. It seems to bear no relation to the normal current of Christ's life, no reference to anything that went before or that followed. The Lord suddenly flashes forth in all the splendour of His deified humanity, glorified saints attend Him, a voice from heaven greets Him as the beloved Son of God, the glory cloud of the Divine Presence envelops Him, and it all vanishes again, passes away without result, leaving everything as it was before. No doubt similar manifestations were accorded to Him on other occasions. But they occurred at critical moments of His life. Once before a voice from heaven greeted Him as the Beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased, and a visible manifestation of the Divine Presence was vouchsafed to Him. But that was at His Baptism—the inauguration of His public ministry on earth. Later, again, a voice spoke to Him from heaven. But that was on the critical occasion of the first advent of the Gentiles to Him. Again, He was received up into the glory cloud of God's Presence, but that was at the Ascension, when His work on earth was accomplished, and He returned to that right hand of the Majesty on High whence He came forth. Here, in the Transfiguration, both voice and cloud are granted Him, and, according to the ordinary interpretation, with no adequate reason.

For want of a better, most people are satisfied with the explanation that its object was to confirm the faith of the disciples. But when this is compared with the occasions referred to which called forth special manifestations of the divine favour, it appears inadequate. Not only is there a want of balance in this explanation, but there are objections to it which are fundamental and conclusive. Such a proceeding

would have been contrary to the method our Lord habitually used in educating His disciples into the knowledge of Himself, and eliciting and strengthening their faith in Him. It had exactly the nature of a sign from heaven such as He uniformly and systematically refused to give in proof of His claims. The force of this objection will be felt by those who have read Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*. Secondly, that could not possibly have any effect whatever on the faith of the disciples of which they were kept in complete ignorance. The three who were admitted as witnesses of the scene were strictly charged to keep it to themselves till after the Resurrection, and they did so. But when that supreme event had happened, it rendered the Transfiguration superfluous for the strengthening of the disciples' faith. The Resurrection and Ascension were the supreme manifestations of the Person and divinity of Christ, beside which even the glories of the Transfiguration lose their splendour. To these, and not to the Transfiguration (with one solitary exception) do the Apostles appeal as the sufficient ground of our faith in Christ. The ignorance in which the bulk of the disciples were carefully kept constitutes, therefore, an unanswerable objection to the suggestion that the purpose of the Transfiguration was the strengthening of the faith of the disciples.

The cumulative force of these three considerations—viz., the apparent absence of any critical occasion, the contradiction presented to our Lord's method of training His disciples, and their ignorance of its occurrence—compel us to search elsewhere for an adequate explanation of the reason and purpose of the Transfiguration.

The late Professor Frederic Godet, in his commentary on St. Luke and in his Biblical Studies, Series II., on the New Testament, has propounded a theory of the occasion and meaning of the Transfiguration which puts all difficulties to flight, sets the incident in its true relation to the other events of our Saviour's life, and at the same time opens up a fresh and marvellous vista of His self-sacrificing love. The word "theory" should not frighten anyone. Rightly understood, it is just as applicable to theology as to any other science. There are theories true and false in physical science as in theology. And the criteria of a true theory are the same in the one as in the other—viz., that it must embrace all the data, give a satisfactory explanation of them all, and be applicable to all known cases. Professor Godet's theory of the Transfiguration fulfils these postulates.

The first point to notice is the secrecy with which it was so carefully shrouded. Our Lord was practically alone on a solitary mountain top. The number of spectators permitted

was only just sufficient to establish beyond doubt the reality of the occurrence, and bear witness thereof in due time to the Church. "At the mouth of two or three witnesses," said the law, "every word shall be established." This feature raises the presumption that the transaction primarily and essentially concerned our Lord alone, and had nothing directly to do with the disciples. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that on another great occasion, when our Lord sought privacy, and what happened confessedly concerned Himself alone—the scene in Gethsemane—the same three disciples, and no more, were chosen as witnesses. The case of the raising of Jairus' daughter is not parallel, for the father and mother were admitted as well as the three, and the object evidently was the avoidance of crowding and disorderly curiosity.

Prima facie, then, we are led to expect that the Transfiguration was an act wholly personal to Christ Himself. But in order to understand its true relation to Himself and His work, it is necessary to enunciate clearly two preliminary principles.

1. That death is not the natural end of man. It requires some hardihood to assert this, for no less a person than Bacon, Lord Verulam, has laid it down that "death is as natural as birth." The truth is that in this, as in so many other cases, the contradiction arises from the double sense which is attached to the words "natural" and "human nature." In one case they are used of our nature as fallen, and in the other of that same nature in its ideal condition as God intended it to be. To the perfect man birth is natural, but death is not. Created in the image of the living God, maintaining a perfect obedience to His commands and an abiding communion with Him, it is inconceivable that he should ever become subject to death. "The man that doeth them, even he shall live by them," is the maxim of the law, and the true principle of human life. To such a man the natural end of the life of the flesh is not death, but translation. Death is uniformly represented in Holy Scripture, from the time of Eden onwards, as the result or the "wages" of sin. Where no sin, no death. If death is universal, it is only because sin is universal. From this point of view the recorded cases of translation become no mere arbitrary exceptions to universal law, granted to personal favourites of the Deity, but sporadic survivals of that law which was originally, and should have remained, the great law of human life. If Enoch "was not, because God took him," the reason was, we are expressly told, that "he walked with God." If an Elijah was carried up into heaven in a chariot of fire, it was because he had served his God with a fidelity till then scarcely paralleled. The other case is that of Moses. As the giver of the law

" which worketh wrath," he could not be wholly spared a taste of death, but the unusual circumstances of his death, the fact that there was no tomb of his in existence, and the curious reference in St. Jude's epistle to a struggle between St. Michael and the devil over his body, would appear to indicate that in his case the separation of soul and body was but temporary, and that they were speedily reunited in glory. This, at least, is what the analogy of the other two instances would lead us to expect in the case of one of whom it is recorded that he was " faithful in all God's house as a servant." From this point of view the translation of the faithful who shall be alive at the time of our Lord's second coming, after the resurrection of those who " are fallen asleep in Jesus," foretold in 1 Thess. iv. 17 and 1 Cor. xv. 51, appears to be no novel and unprecedented procedure, but only the final reappearance of this primary law of human nature.

The natural end of the righteous man, then, is not death, but translation.

2. The second principle is that God is just. This may seem almost too elementary to need notice, but it is necessary to remember that, being just, God can refuse to no man that which he has earned: death to him who deserves death, life to him who has won life.

Turning now our thoughts once more to our Lord, it will be abundantly evident that He of all men had won the right to tread the easy and glorious passage of translation from this life to the next. If Enoch " walked with God," Christ maintained an infinitely closer communion with Him. If Moses " served God as a servant," Christ as a Son. If Elijah was a representative prophet, Christ was the Prophet " who should come." It was only right and reasonable, therefore, that when His work on earth was done, He should have at least the offer and opportunity of passing to His rest without death. And it would seem that the wonderful scene on the mountain top which we call the Transfiguration was nothing else than such an offer made to our Lord by God the Father which He might have accepted if He would. It is most important to notice the exact moment at which it happened. It is generally agreed that it occurred in the late summer of A.D. 28 or 29, or about eight months before the Crucifixion. This was a critical epoch in our Lord's life on earth. By that time He had accomplished all that part of His work which it was possible to complete without dying. For thirty-two years, in private and in public, He had lived the life of perfect obedience and communion. His work as a Teacher and Prophet had reached its climax, for the disciples had learnt to recognize in Him " the Christ, the Son of the living

God." In all three of the Synoptics the time of the Transfiguration is carefully fixed at from six to eight days after St. Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi.

There remained the second division of our Lord's work, that of Atonement, which only could be accomplished through death. But to be fully effectual this death must be wholly voluntary; and it could not be entirely voluntary if the offer of escape therefrom had not first been made to the Sufferer. That offer was made at the Transfiguration. This event occurred, then, at a highly critical epoch of our Lord's life on earth. It marked the completion of His work of obedience and teaching. It inaugurated the work of Atonement. It was the seal of the divine approval and acceptance of the one; it gave the other that character of voluntariness without which it would not have been effectual. The normal end of human life was offered to the Perfect Man, and refused by Him.

When this view of the nature of the event is understood and accepted, then all its subordinate incidents are seen to be in perfect harmony with it and with each other; each one takes its proper place of dignity and importance with regard to it.

The glorious change which passed over our Lord's person and countenance was the indication that the offer was genuine, not made in words only. The gates of glory stood open to Him; His foot was on the threshold; He had but to take a step to leave for ever this world and all its sorrows behind Him, and reap the reward He had earned. But no, He would not; for, had He done so, He must have passed in alone, and left an unsaved world outside. He had come to save mankind, and this should be done at all costs to Himself. He will not enter the golden gates until He can carry the multitude of His redeemed with Him.

The choice of Moses and Elijah as the messengers sent to receive and welcome the returning Hero now appears altogether appropriate. Not only did they come as the founder of the Jewish Church and its principal prophet, but as the only two representatives of that Church who had themselves trod the deathless path to glory along which they were to conduct their Lord. On all other occasions angels had the honour of ministering to Him.

The subject of their conversation, too, appears to be quite proper to the occasion. It was, as St. Luke tells us, "His decease which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem." The word in the margin is "*departure*," which is a better representative of the original "exodos" than "decease"; for the term is a peculiar one, evidently chosen with care by St. Luke, as applying equally well to either mode of departure, that of

translation or of death. So that with very little stretch of imagination we may gather that in this wonderful conversation our Lord was explaining to His two great forerunners that He could not accompany them along that glorious and easy path to bliss, but must follow rather that of death upon the Cross. With this, again, harmonizes the statement made a little later in the chapter by St. Luke, that from that time "He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem," knowing that there stood the Cross.

On this view the injunction to silence becomes natural and reasonable. The Transfiguration had no immediate reference to the needs of the infant Church at the time. The knowledge of it would have puzzled, rather than helped, the bulk of the disciples, and would probably have led them to actions as absurd and irrelevant as were the proposals of St. Peter on the mount itself.

Finally, it should be noted that all three Synoptics agree that the glory cloud of God's Presence did not appear, nor was the voice of approval heard, until Moses and Elijah had begun to take their departure without Christ, causing St. Peter to utter his strange proposal to detain them by pitching three tabernacles for them. St. Luke says expressly: "It came to pass, *as they were parting* from them, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here. . . : And *while he said* these things, there came a cloud and overshadowed them." Our Lord's choice by that time had been fully and finally made, and the divine manifestations were the emphatic expression of the Father's approval at the inauguration of the work of the Atonement, just as similar manifestations at the Baptism had indicated a similar approval at the inauguration of the work of the public Ministry.

The Transfiguration, then, in the career of the Incarnate Son of God, ranks only second in importance to the Incarnation itself. It was the second and final step in His self-humiliation. If that was the renunciation on His part of all His glory and majesty as the eternal Son of the Almighty Father, this was a similar renunciation by Him of all the rights, privileges, and honours which belonged to Him as the Son of Man. "Being in the form of God," in inspired language, "He had* set no store by His equality with God, but had emptied Himself," and now "being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself" yet further. He refused what was due to Him as perfect man, and chose the lot of sinners. No easy translation for Him, but the death which was "the wages of sin." And not even the death of a citizen, but the shameful end of a felon and slave.

* Dean Robinson's paraphrase.

The scene on the mountain top which we call the Transfiguration was the occasion when He freely and irrevocably chose that path of profoundest humiliation and uttermost love, and the festival should therefore rank in our calendar as next in dignity to Christmas.

WM. L. GROVES.

[In the Revised Prayer Book all agree that there shall be a special Preface in the Holy Communion Service for the Feast of the Transfiguration, the proposed words being: "Because by the mystery of Thine incarnate Word the light of Thy glory did shine anew upon mankind; to the intent that we might be transformed into His image from glory to glory." The Collect is: "Almighty and everlasting God, whose blessed Son was revealed to the three Apostles when He was transfigured on the Holy Mount, and in the excellent glory spake with Moses and Elijah of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem; grant to us Thy servants that though now we see Him not, yet in faith beholding the light of His countenance, we may be strengthened to bear the cross; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord." The Epistle is 1 St. John iii. 1-3. The Gospel is St. Mark ix. 2-7.]

JOHN NEWTON

How many of the millions to whom "Glorious things of thee are spoken" and "How sweet the Name of Jesus sounds" are among the most familiar and best-loved hymns could say offhand who wrote them? And of those, how many know anything of him? The extraordinary life of John Newton has slipped into the subconscious of history, whence it is worth while, at least once in a hundred years, to resuscitate it. For it is just two centuries ago, on July 24, 1725, that he was born, of respectable but not rich London parents, his father a Master Mariner in the Mediterranean trade, his mother a pious Dissenter, who destined her boy from his earliest years to St. Andrew's and the ministry. Before she died of a consumption in his seventh year, she had taught the boy to read well and to know by heart the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, with the "proofs," and all of the smaller catechisms and children's hymns of Dr. Isaac Watts. But her death and his father's remarriage to the daughter of a well-to-do Essex grazier went far to undo his mother's work, and the boy fell into neglect and bad companionships. His father was a stern man, and feared

by his son, who says of him and of his step-mother that they were sensible and moral, but not religious; curiously enough, the father had been educated at a Jesuit college near Seville. After only two years of schooling at Stratford, in Essex, where he learned some Latin, but little else, John went to sea in his father's ship at the age of eleven, and made five voyages to the Mediterranean. In some ways he must have been precocious: at the age of fourteen, in an interval between voyages, he fell violently in love with the girl who was to be, twelve years later, his wife; and even earlier than that he had begun to know the spiritual upheavals which so often accompany adolescence. Before twelve he "was often disturbed with religious convictions," and had read books like Bennett's *Christian Oratory* and the *Family Instructor*. He fell into religion and out again with characteristic frequency. For two years he kept up a high standard of "asceticism," but at seventeen his mind was "a medley of religion, philosophy, and indolence." The reading of the Rhapsody in Shaftesbury's *Characteristics* undermined his faith, and led him, if his own *Narration* is to be trusted, into carelessness and profligacy. In 1742, during his sixth voyage, a dream recalled him for a time to thoughts of religion—a dream which shows us, if it did not show him, that he was more or less deliberately repressing the conflict between religion and nature. The scene was the harbour of Venice, where he had lately been; it was night, and he was alone on deck, walking to and fro on the watch, when a person brought to him a ring, with the express charge to guard it carefully, and the warning of heavy penalties for its loss. When he had accepted it, another person came and persuaded him to throw it overboard; but the moment it touched the water he saw a terrible fire burst out upon the distant Alps, and spread till all the mountains were aflame. In his agony of remorse and fear the first person reappeared, chided him, and recovered the ring, and the fire was quenched; but the giver of the ring kept it, with the promise to bring it to him whenever he should need it.

The effect of this dream was transitory enough. A year later he had lost all religion, and found himself impressed as a midshipman on H.M.S. *Harwich*. He promptly deserted, only to be as promptly retaken, whipped, and degraded, and finally transferred to another ship bound for Sierra Leone. There he was landed on the island of Benanoes as the servant of a slave-trader who had married a native wife, at whose hands Newton suffered great hardships, softened by the consolations of a volume of Euclid, which he set himself to master. Better times came with his transfer to another trader, and in 1747 he managed to get aboard a ship bound for home. On board he found and

read Stanhope's translation of Thomas à Kempis and Beveridge on the Passion, but a terrible storm which the vessel encountered threw him into despair, for it recalled to him the words: "When your fear cometh as a storm, and your calamity cometh on as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish come upon you, then shall they call upon Me, but I will not answer; then shall they seek Me diligently, but they shall not find Me; for that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord." Nevertheless, he now got to the point of wishing that Christianity were true, and desiring to examine the evidence for it. The wish was perhaps more potent than the evidence available, but before he landed, in April, 1748, Newton was convinced of the truth of the Gospel, and he began to go to church and to receive the Sacrament. But a second voyage to Sierra Leone and a third to South Carolina with a cargo of slaves threw him back, and he became as bad as before, with the exception, he says, of profaneness. A providential fever again restored him to renewed fervour and faith, and to the resumed study of Latin; and he does not seem to have had another bad lapse. Coming home in 1750, he married his early love, but he made three more voyages in the next four years in his own ship. Twice every Sunday he read prayers with his crew, and kept up his Latin: Juvenal, Livy, Cæsar, and Sallust. He took to keeping a diary—which in the eighteenth century was an argument of piety—and read religious books. "I never knew," he says, "sweeter or more frequent hours of divine communion than in my two last voyages to Guinea. . . . I have wandered through the woods, reflecting on the singular goodness of the Lord to me." He did not reflect that the goodness of the Lord was a more difficult notion to the shackled slaves in his hold!

In 1754, a fit of some kind, probably epileptic, determined Newton to give up seafaring, and the following year he settled in Liverpool as Surveyor of Tides. Here he began to study Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac, and to think seriously of the sacred ministry. His first inclination to become a Dissenting minister was overruled by the advice of a friend, and he proceeded to seek ordination in the Church, which he "preferred in some respects." Twice the Archbishop of York, "Leaden Gilbert," who was said to feed "more like a pig of Epicurus than the head of a Christian Church," refused to ordain him, even with the backing of the Bishop of Chester and the promise of a title. But Newton preached, nevertheless, and in 1764 the Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Green, ordained him to the curacy of Olney, in spite of the fact that he had ventured to differ from his Lordship in the very brief oral examination to which he was subjected. He was made priest the following year.

It is in connection with Olney that Newton is best remembered, for it was there that his association began with the poet Cowper, with whom he collaborated to write the "Olney Hymns." The Vicar, Moses Brown, was non-resident, and Newton had a free hand to carry on the work which was to make Olney the Mecca of Evangelicalism. Nearly a century later the Scottish Presbyterian, Hugh Miller, visited the "pleasantly grouped village" with the piety of a pilgrim, his indignation still fresh from the "Puseyism" he had seen in Birmingham. But in Newton's day there was no Puseyism; there was little enough that could even be called Christianity at all, at least in country districts. Cowper, writing under Newton's eye, describes the typical country parson:

> "Loose in morals and in manners vain,
> In conversation frivolous, in dress
> Extreme; at once rapacious and profuse,
> Frequent in park with lady at his side,
> Ambling and prattling scandal as he goes,
> But rare at home, and never at his books."

He speaks of—

> "The things that mount the rostrum with a skip,
> And then skip down again, pronounce a text,
> Cry, hem! and reading what they never wrote,
> Just fifteen minutes, huddle up their work,
> And with a well-bred whisper close the scene."

And George Crabbe, with his stronger sense of churchmanship and his dislike of "enthusiasm," could be even more severe:

> "A jovial youth, who thinks his Sunday task
> As much as God or man can fairly ask;
> The rest he gives to loves and labours light,
> To fields the morning and to feasts the night;
> None better skilled the noisy pack to guide,
> To urge their chase, to cheer them or to chide;
> A sportsman keen, he shoots through half the day,
> And, skilled at whist, devotes the nights to play."

It was against such a state of things that the Evangelicalism of men like Newton was directed, just as Puseyism was in the next generation; for even Hugh Miller had to admit that "revived Anglo-Catholicism" was an "aggressive and increscent power" among the poor. Newton visited his people and shunned controversy. His near neighbour, Thomas Scott, curate of Weston Underwood, tried to draw him into argument, and failed; but Newton's example converted Scott, who was "almost a Socinian," and when Newton left Olney, Scott succeeded him. He says of Newton that he was "benevolent, disinterested, inoffensive, and laborious."

Newton worked for sixteen years at Olney on a miserable

stipend eked out by an annual allowance from the munificent John Thornton—the fairy godfather of Evangelicalism. He filled his church to the extent of having to build a gallery, and for those who did not come to church he held "cottage lectures." He did not scruple to join with William Bull, a Dissenting neighbour, for public prayer-meetings, and he could gather more than a hundred people at five o'clock in the morning for special prayer upon the outbreak of the American War. But it cannot be said that the results of his work were very deep or permanent. He admitted himself, at the time of his removal from Olney, that he had "lived to bury the old crop, on which any dependence could be placed"; and he saw in the obstreperous way in which the younger generation kept Guy Fawkes' Day the evidence of an "incorrigible spirit." And his successor and disciple, William Scott, says of the inhabitants of Olney that they are become "wiser than their teachers—that is, they think themselves so—and in an awful manner have learned to abuse the Gospel notions, to stupefy their consciences, vindicate their sloth and wickedness, and shield off conviction." It would seem that the methods which Newton used made less appeal to the younger generation than to their elders, and it may be doubted if his personality was one to make religion attractive. Walter Bagehot says of him that he was "one of those who seem intended to make excellence disagreeable," and there seems to have been a touch of vexation in his sympathy with Cowper's unfortunate mental troubles, as well as a singular lack of wisdom in the methods by which he sought to treat them. The poet was too loyal a friend to complain openly, but his letters show that Newton's removal to London in 1780 was something of a relief. It is, indeed, in his relations with Cowper that Newton and his theology show at their worst. His Calvinism, although by no means extreme, was sufficiently insistent upon the "assurance of salvation" to leave no hope in the more subtle and sensitive mind of the poet; and it can hardly be doubted that his drastic violation of Cowper's reticence hastened the sad end. Newton was, says Bagehot again, "a converting engine"; and the butterfly was broken on the wheel.

In 1780 Newton accepted from John Thornton the living of St. Mary Woolnoth in Lombard Street. The church had traditions of learning and piety from the work of two former incumbents, Josias Shute and Ralph Robinson, and Newton found himself in a congenial sphere. He preached twice every Sunday and on Wednesday mornings, and although his subjects were often topical, he avoided politics. On Sunday mornings he says that he preached with more brevity and caution because "two or three of my bankers" might be present! His utterance

was far from clear and his attitudes ungraceful, but he attracted many by his "parent-like tenderness and affection," and his brilliant allusions and happy illustrations. Perhaps his most striking course of sermons is the course of fifty upon the texts of Handel's *Messiah*. He imagines a number of persons accused of high treason and confined, but not yet tried; their guilt, however, is so plain that their only hope is in the King's pardon, which is freely offered to them. Instead of taking a single step to comply with his goodness, they employ themselves in setting to music the coming trial: the procedure of the court, the judge's summing-up and the sentence, and even the King's offer of pardon. "And this, together with a description of their present state, and of the fearful doom awaiting them if they continue obstinate, is sung for their diversion, accompanied with the sound of cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of instruments!"

Newton's official biographer, Richard Cecil, says that his doctrine was strictly that of the Church of England, and that, although he had a cordial regard for Dissenters, he was unwilling to act publicly with them. It is sometimes not realized how strong a sense of churchmanship and priesthood the early Evangelicals could feel. Cecil himself writes: "I never choose to forget that I am a priest, because I would not deprive myself of the right to dictate in my ministerial capacity." And again: "Because Papists have made too much of some things, Protestants have made too little of them. Papists treat man as all sense; therefore some Protestants would treat him as all spirit. Because one party has exalted the Virgin Mary as a divinity, the other can hardly think of that most highly favoured among women with common respect." Newton's mind was not theological. He says of himself that he was "considered as an Arminian among the high Calvinists, and as a Calvinist among the strenuous Arminians." He hated Popery, he said, "whether it be on a throne, as at Rome, or upon a bench or at a board, as sometimes in London." "The worst Pope I ever met with is Pope Self." And in his later years he seems to have insisted less on "assurance" and the state of the feelings. "I would not give a straw for that assurance which sin will not damp. If David had come from his adultery, and had talked of his assurance at that time, I should have despised his speech. . . . Don't tell me of your feelings. A traveller would be glad of fine weather; but if he be a man of business, he will go on." These sayings are from his *Table Talk*, which shows the man at his best, full of the rugged but practical sagacity which made him the valued adviser, almost the father-confessor, of such minds as Hannah More and Samuel Wilberforce. And it was,

perhaps, the latter who aroused Newton to denounce the slave-trade and his own earlier connection with it.

For twenty-seven years Newton remained at St. Mary Woolnoth, living in Coleman Street Buildings. In his family life he was, says his biographer tactfully, "admired more safely than imitated"; but his love for his wife, if perhaps somewhat ruggedly expressed, remained the ruling passion of his earthly life, even to the point of making him doubt its legitimacy. She died in 1790, and after her death it was his custom to go into "an annual seclusion for a special recollection of her, from which proceeded a sort of little elegies or sonnets to her memory." At the age of eighty he was urged to retire, but his answer is characteristic: "What! shall the old African blasphemer stop while he can speak?" It sums up the motive force of all his life and work, the secret of his spiritual influence. *Haud ignara mali miseris succurrere disco* was his motto, and it had special pertinence in one whose life had been what his had been. Students of conversion have learned to discount the testimony of the convert himself, because he generally exaggerates his former wickedness; and it is quite probable that Newton was never as bad as he painted himself. But he was quite bad enough to make his conversion a reality, both for himself and for others, and we must be grateful that he left a first-hand account of it. English literature is not rich in the autobiography of conversion; it has no parallel to such accounts as Verlaine, Huysmans, Coppée, Retté, and other notable French converts have given to the world; and Newton's *Narration* is one of a small class, and it is his nearest approach to literary merit, if we except the few fine hymns from the Olney collection, of which the best may be found in the Oxford Hymnal. By them his name will live, and from time to time lead men to remember afresh the life and work of a devoted Christian priest. No worker for God could place before himself a better maxim than this of Newton's: "When I hear a knock at my study door, I hear a message from God. It may be a lesson of instruction, perhaps a lesson of patience; but since it is His message, it must be interesting."

W. S. Porter.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE Editor hopes to be away from home for a month's holiday between August 10 and September 10, and would be glad to be spared correspondence relating to THEOLOGY, so far as possible, between those dates.

We have received a copy of a powerful charge, entitled *Sane Catholicism*, delivered by the Right Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont, U.S.A. Dr. Hall is known as one of the most learned dogmatic theologians of the Anglican Communion; and his charge deserves to be widely read, not least its discussion of the dangers attaching to the cult of the Reserved Sacrament. "Christ in us, rather than before us, is the boast of the Christian."

CHARLES FOX BURNEY

AN APPRECIATION

To scholars the world over the death of Professor C. F. Burney, of St. John's College, Oxford, is a serious loss. It is not for me to write of his splendid contributions to Biblical scholarship from his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* to his *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. I will only try to speak of him as he was known to the little world of students, in the days before the war, who were fortunate enough to come under his influence. There was something particularly attractive to the average undergraduate in the youthful-looking athletic don whose familiar figure on horseback and on the towing-path will long remain a vivid picture to very many.

The attraction became greater when you got to know Dr. Burney as a friend. I well remember hearing men talk about him with enthusiasm in days when I only knew him by sight, and did not realize his kindliness and generosity.

To students he gave and gave freely. His splendid rooms in Canterbury Quadrangle seemed always open to many comers. They were a very shrine for his men, and were regarded somewhat with the reverence with which we viewed their learned occupant. The Mohammedan prayer-mat on the wall, the hanging Eastern lamp and the model map of Jerusalem, were looked upon with almost affectionate regard. In the larger room the Doctor gave his lectures on Isaiah, sitting at the head of the long table with its pile of Hebrew Bibles and a larger pile of books by his side, which he frequently consulted. To the inner sanctum men came to read their "papers," and here during one vacation at least a cheerful party discussed with tea and crumpets St. Paul's Epistles and the Apostolic Fathers. Questions asked were answered freely and with minutest care, books in which the subject might be further studied being gladly lent to any who cared to read them.

Matters, which often ranged over a wide circle, discussed at these reading parties and informal lectures were not forgotten at other times, and knotty points which appealed to the members were alluded to when you met the lecturer in the quadrangle and elsewhere; the Doctor ready to impart fresh information he had gleaned, or fresh light which he thought had fallen on the subject.

Some of us used to discuss among ourselves what was the great work for which he was evidently preparing. It turned out afterwards to be *Israel's Settlement in Canaan: The Biblical Tradition and its Historical Background*, and his magnificent Commentary on the Book of Judges.

Nor did his interest cease in the men who had gone down. Those who were fortunate enough for a time to be still within reach of college found the Doctor's help given as generously as ever. The Study Class on Isaiah was also open to graduates and the door of the sanctum to individual students, some of whom did not leave it until quite late at night. To all who came to him for help Dr. Burney gave gladly of his best; he used to the full the unique opportunities of an Oxford tutor, inspiring and encouraging many by his kindliness, sympathy, and great learning.

R. D. Middleton.

NOTES

THE FRENCH CHURCH TO-DAY

An American book by Denis Gwynn, *The Catholic Reaction in France*, gives much valuable information about our near but little-known neighbour. The author is an Irish Roman Catholic journalist resident in France.

Practising Catholics are reckoned at from 5 to 10 millions out of nearly 40 millions. The situation varies greatly in different parts. In some of the departments of the south and west Catholicism seems to be dying, but so is the general population. Brittany and Western Normandy are the brightest spots. In the industrial suburbs of Paris the Church is far behind. One church serves 72,000 people. Not more than 10 per cent. of the population are in any way accessible to the ministrations of religion. But nearly everywhere the Church is stronger than before the Separation Law.

The war record of the French Church is marvellous; 32,000 ecclesiastics were mobilized, of whom 4,618 were killed, 10,414 mentioned in despatches, and 9,378 won the Croix de Guerre.

In some dioceses the shortage of priests is such that half of them are over sixty. But the seminaries are full, and the future is not feared. A priest's salary for the year is 900 francs or less. Besides that, there are Mass fees of 5 francs each, fees for other rites, and gifts in kind. But ordination to the priesthood entails poverty equal to that of any monk.

Everywhere the Church sets up rival organizations to those of the State. Catholic Universities and schools are supported by the faithful, Catholic Scouts are found, organizations of Catholic engineers, etc. In some districts the State schoolmaster is well paid and has no pupils: the Catholic schools are full, with teachers paid only 100 to 200 francs a month.

La Bonne Presse publishes *La Croix*, which has a circulation of 400,000. Strictly controlled by the Assumptionist Fathers, it gives diocesan news, etc., in place of sport and fashions. The same press has a network of 500 local Catholic papers. It has organized a band of 50,000 voluntary salesmen. The sale of each volume of the *Lives of the Saints* series is 500,000 or more. One priest-editor owns a line of ships, a fish-curing business, and a garage as subsidiary enterprises. There is a demand at present for Catholic paper-mills.

The Catholic trades union movement is growing at the expense of the revolutionary unions. Though it has broken up strikes it is resolutely opposed to modern capitalism.

Birth-control has become a firmly-rooted habit. Originating in the determination of the small landowners not to ruin their holdings by excessive subdivision, it would probably continue among the secularist majority even if the law of inheritance were altered. There is a likelihood of the secularists becoming extinct and their place being taken by a new Catholic stock. As a sign of the future, the Ministry of Agriculture is colonizing the depopulated Garonne Valley with sturdy Bretons who are re-introducing Catholicism.

The book fills the reader with intense admiration for the heroic French Church, but with deep regret for the embittered relations which cause such a cleavage between the two sections of the nation. Imagine an England in which all our institutions from Universities to Boy Scouts, Railway Unions to daily papers, had to be duplicated, and labelled Christian or non-Christian!

THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

THE publication of Dr. M. R. James' *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1924) gives the English reader a complete corpus of all the Apocryphal Gospels and Acts, Unwritten sayings of Our Lord, etc. In view of recent discussions it may be useful to consider the story of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary on a background of similar literature.

Sir W. M. Ramsay has argued in a spirited fashion for the existence of authentic fragments of tradition in the Acts of Paul and Thecla, one of the episodes which make up the Acts of Paul. Of this book Tertullian says: "A presbyter in Asia, who put together that book, heaping up a narrative as it were from his own materials under Paul's name, when after conviction he confessed that he had done it from love of Paul, resigned his position" (*De Bapt.* 17). The date cannot be fixed more accurately than between 160 and 200. This, then, is the origin of the document which ranks among the best of these Apocrypha, and is classed by Eusebius with the Shepherd of Hermas and the Apocalypse of Peter as "spurious" (*H.E.* iii. 25).

Of the Acts of John, and other Apocryphal Acts and Gospels, Eusebius warmly declares that "they are forgeries of heretics; so that we must not count them even among the spurious books, but reject them as in every way monstrous and impious" (*ibid.*). Sometime between 140 and 180, at Ephesus, seems to be the date of the Acts of John, which contain some fine mystical passages of a Gnostic tendency. The narrative portion cannot be taken very seriously, in the light of the following extract (60, 61; James, p. 242).

[The party reach an inn and retire for the night, John on a bedstead, the others on the floor.]

"He when he lay down was troubled by the bugs, and as they continued to become yet more troublesome to him, when it was now about the middle of the night, in the hearing of us all he said to them: I say unto you, O bugs, behave yourselves, one and all, and leave your abode for this night and remain quiet in one place, and keep your distance from the servants of God. . . . When the day was now dawning I arose first, and with me Verus and Andronicus, and we saw at the door of the house which we had taken a great number of bugs standing, and while we wondered at the sight of them, and all the brethren were roused up

because of them, John continued sleeping. And when he was awake we declared to him what we had seen. And he sat up on the bed and looked at them and said: Since ye have well behaved yourselves in hearkening to my rebuke, come into your place. And when he had said this, and risen from the bed, the bugs running from the door hasted to the bed and climbed up by the legs thereof and disappeared into the joints."

Did an unknown presbyter compose this somewhat Rabelaisian story "for the love of John"?

In one version the Acts end with the Assumption of John's body. "We brought a linen cloth and spread it upon him, and went into the city. And on the day following we went forth and found not his body, for it was translated by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ" (115; James, p. 270).

We are now in a position to appreciate the narratives of the Virgin's Assumption, which occupy pp. 194-227 of Dr. James' volume. There is as yet no critical text of the legend, but clearly it must be ranked considerably below the Apocryphal Acts, about which Eusebius spoke his mind so freely. The legend, according to Dr. James, originated in Egypt, and the Sahidic and Bohairic texts deserve special attention. The first Bohairic account will be sufficient for our purpose. It purports to be a Homily by Evodius, Archbishop of *Rome*, successor of Peter, an eye-witness of what he relates.

He and the apostles lived with Mary and the holy women after the Passion. On the 20th day of the month Tobi Jesus came and ordained Peter archbishop, and others presbyters, deacons, readers, psalmists and doorkeepers, and returned to heaven. Next day He came with thousands of angels and David, and said He was going to take Mary. She shrouded herself in heavenly garments and lay down. Jesus sat by her side. When death came, Mary's soul leaped into the bosom of her Son, and He gave it to Michael. Jesus then fastened up the body in its shroud, bade the apostles bury it, and went up to heaven with Mary's soul in the chariot of the Cherubim. On the fourth day, as the apostles were by the tomb, a voice from heaven told them to go away and return on the 16th of Mesore.

In the seventh month after her death (Mesore 15) they assembled, and at dawn of the 16th Jesus came, and, presently, Mary seated in the chariot of the Cherubim, and there were greetings. "Such was . . . her assumption on 16th Mesore. I, Evodius, saw it all."

The actual assumption is passed over in silence. Another text describes it. "(Jesus) called into the tomb: Mary, my mother, arise! And we saw her in the body, as if she had never died. Jesus took her into the chariot. . . . We went to the tomb and found the garments where the body had lain: we buried them."

Later versions amplify the story, but add nothing of essential importance. The belief in the Assumption of the Virgin Mary deserves most respectful treatment, but surely as something in the realm of symbol and sacred myth rather than as a fact of history. Cardinal Newman's words express the belief in grave and dignified language: "It was becoming that she should be taken up into heaven and not lie in the grave until Christ's Second Coming, who had passed a life of sanctity and of miracle such as hers." But is our sense of what is "becoming" a safe guide to God's ways?

W. K. L. C.

REVIEWS

IGNORANCE, FAITH, AND CONFORMITY. Studies in Moral Theology. By Kenneth E. Kirk. Longmans, 1925. 8s. 6d.

To what extent the plea of "invincible ignorance" may legitimately be made on behalf of members of the Church who reject part of her teaching about faith or morals is obviously a problem acutely relevant in England to-day. For this reason Mr. Kirk's most interesting and scholarly book is warmly to be welcomed. Naturally it is designed primarily for priests and others who have to interpret the faith; its perusal requires considerable concentration, and there is a good deal of untranslated Latin in the text. The starting-point is the age-long conflict between conscience and law. Are infants and those who have never heard the Gospel to be condemned for their unbelief? The author finds the phrase "invincible ignorance" first in the writings of Abailard, who says, "I cannot see that guilt is involved . . . in any act which results from invincible ignorance, and cannot therefore be foreseen; as, for example, if a huntsman kills some unseen person in a wood with his arrow, thinking he is shooting at beasts or birds."

Here, and in the works of St. Thomas, the problem is a comparatively simple one. But "the sixteenth century presented Catholicism with two fresh problems. The first was that of innumerable heathen in the New World on whom the preaching of the Gospel made little or no impression; the second, that of baptized and professing Christians who, by the accident of birth and education, were so inured to heresy that they could not grasp the true faith even when it was put before them." Faced with these problems, Catholic writers suggested that a man who had heard the faith propounded, but was conscientiously unable to accept it, might be regarded as blameless. This was certainly one step forward; but what about the *ultimate salvation* of such conscientious unbelievers?

The words attributed to Christ, "He that believeth not shall be damned," seemed final (and have been quoted as final in a letter from a well-known Roman Catholic to the present writer, despite the fact that they only occur in the ending of St. Mark's Gospel). The discovery of America put the theory of the miraculous enlightenment of individual heathen beyond the bounds of reasonable possibility. Consequently there flourished the various theories of a limbo for the virtuous heathen, even though they had heard the Gospel and rejected it. Nobody,

however, actually took the step, which Mr. Kirk tentatively suggests, of regarding this limbo as a preparatory training for heaven.

With some support from Catholic writers, Mr. Kirk puts the most generous interpretation possible upon the statements of the Vatican Council with regard to honest doubt.

We question whether the majority of English Roman Catholics would allow his interpretation, though he might well find more support in Germany and France. "There may be sin in secession from the Church," he concludes, "on grounds of conscientious inability to believe or conform—that is for God to judge—but it need not be the grave sin of formal heresy, and involve inevitable loss of ultimate salvation."

Dr. J. P. Arendzen, however, writing about Papal Infallibility in the *Catholic Gazette* for August, 1923, says, "A moment's doubt deliberately admitted would mean a deadly sin, and if not repented of would mean eternal damnation."

The last chapter on "Conformity" is very important. In it the writer presses the rather difficult distinction between the "general indefectibility" of the Church and its strict infallibility. "The doctrine of the general indefectibility and inerrancy of the Church, without any detailed theory as to its actual infallibility on special occasions, is of universal acceptance." Anglicans, he argues, are in no way committed to belief in infallibility, and therefore an Anglican who is unable to accept one of the articles of the Christian faith, at least cannot be condemned on the ground that he is thereby casting doubt on other articles. This is perhaps the least convincing passage in the book. It is admitted that a stage of unbelief may come when ecclesiastic censure should follow; and we entirely agree that this "has no *necessary* bearing whatever on the question of moral guilt."

Mr. Kirk believes more than we do in the desirability of "the present condition of uncertainty as to doctrine and morals obtaining in the Church of England"; but if the only alternative were the rigorous external conformity required in the Roman communion, we doubt which would be preferable. On the whole, the book is a valuable contribution to an important and neglected subject. We may add that no one should omit to read the footnotes, which are often interesting and occasionally trenchant.

F. Hood.

"REAL" THEOLOGY

THE THEOLOGY OF THE REAL. By R. Gordon Milburn. Williams and Norgate. 10s. 6d.

It is difficult to know from what point of view to approach this book. It consists in large part of a bitter onslaught upon Christian faith and (in one sphere at least) Christian morals, and its constructive philosophy bears, so far as we are able to judge, little or no relation to Christianity. We observe, further, that the author's last work was issued by the Theosophical Publishing House; and it is difficult to conceive that he really supposes his general thesis in the present volume to be compatible even with the most advanced Modernism. On the other hand, Mr. Milburn is a priest; his name appears in *Crockford;* he more than once uses such phrases as "we clergy," "we Churchpeople"; and he seems to assume throughout that his theological "reconstruction" does yet remain Christian. We venture to think that, on the contrary, if words have any meaning at all, Christian theology and "The Theology of the Real" are, broadly considered, simple antitheses, and that for the author to suggest that they are not is merely disingenuous. However, let the reader judge.

The Theology of the Real is a biggish book. But that is not the only reason why we cannot hope to do full justice to all its arguments here, and must therefore choose a few points only on which to comment. Truth to tell, the author's precise meaning sometimes escapes our most concentrated effort to understand. No doubt the following sentence, for example, will be luminously clear to some readers of THEOLOGY: we confess it is hardly so to us.

> "Realization, then, is that act whereby, through inward effort, we identify ourselves with our true, or transcendental, self as it exists in God, and force upon ourselves the conviction that since our true nature is divine we declare the annulment of this or that source of trouble, and through faith in God, the one true and real Mind with which our true selves are organically one, rest assured that since that trouble is now condemned to non-existence we will no longer recognize even its apparent existence except as an occasion for this act of realization."

(It is perhaps significant that this sentence occurs in a section which defends the metaphysical system of *Science and Health.* Bishop Temple has recently described the philosophy of Christian Science as "singularly imbecile." No doubt some people would quarrel with the adjective: but it certainly applies to Mrs. Eddy's *style,* which, we fear, has infected Mr. Milburn. His view of "Spiritual Science" in general is sufficiently indicated by his comparison of it with medical treatment. "Neither method is infallible, and it remains a choice of risks." We may leave it at that.)

Mr. Milburn's criticisms of "popular religion" and of "Christian mythology" are drastic. By the latter he means the Catholic creed which—picturesquely described as "the Christian Saga"—is "purely legendary": by the former, the fatuous notion that "the grace of God" is "a practical answer to an urgent moral need."

> "That is the faith . . . is it true? In the majority of cases it is not true. . . . Our present question is: What is the cure for mental and moral bondage? Is it God? Is it true that the serious practice of the Christian religion . . . does normally lead to Redemption, to emancipation, to inward harmony, strength, goodness, joy, and a sense of peace with the Infinite? Normally it does not; normally man does not find in God, or in Christ, a Saviour and Redeemer."

Now, this is a matter of *fact;* a matter, further, which in this connection is unaffected by questions of delusion, subjectivity, auto-suggestion, and so on. And our criticism of the statement must begin by simply denying it. In its full context the argument will be found to derive its plausibility from a somewhat specious confusion of terms. In one sentence, that is to say, the author seems to be referring to merely conventional and, as it were, "exterior" religion—saying of prayers, perfunctory attendance at church, and so on; in the next he denies that "the serious practice of the Christian religion" leads a man to God. But a critic is justified in asking the author to say which he means. Now, no responsible person has ever suggested that merely conventional Christianity ever brought a man to God: but the testimony, not merely of the saints, but of every Christian soul in every age, is unanimous, that no one who "seriously" sought God ever failed to find Him. Mr. Milburn's appeal here is to that of experience. We assert unhesitatingly that, stripped of its vagueness, it fails. It should be added that he attaches to the Christian doctrine of prayer a meaning which is strictly foreign to it. He assumes that men turn to God in order to get peace of mind, inward harmony, etc. But that is not Christian prayer at all, which is an end in itself (though having inevitable consequences)—namely, the intercourse of a child with his Father. When men pray for the sake of what there is to be got out of it for themselves, they commonly get very little. In other passages Mr. Milburn admits the validity of "religious" experience, and explains the fact that some men do not seem to have it by ascribing it to "a theoid formation within the individual psyche which exercises those functions which are attributed to God." We fear this conception is not quite the Pauline one of the indwelling Christ: we cannot fancy the Apostle, living to-day and using the language of high-brow psychology, proclaiming that "It is no longer I that live, but a theoid centre that functioneth in me."

No doubt the section of this book which deals with sexual ethics will be hailed in certain quarters as a brave attempt to shake off the fetters of convention and tradition. After some ill-bred sneers at "British sex morality" and "the tradition of the Church" as standing for "a complex of property-ethics, security, propriety, domesticity, comfort, church-going, orthodoxy, and law-abiding habits felt as a cultural whole," and a paragraph or two of clap-trap about sex as "the human sacrament of which all should partake," the author proceeds to reconstructive details: we are obliged to refer here to one or two of the more nauseating of these. Recourse to prostitutes is held by Mr. Milburn—who has been assured by one who has practised it that he felt "all the better man for having done so"—to be "morally beneficial in some cases." (To the man, of course, Mr. Milburn means. Whether or not he thinks it may sometimes be "morally beneficial" to the woman we are not informed: this

question is relegated, as a debatable point, to "social" ethics.) The *liaison*—between a man and a woman who "are attracted to one another and desire occasional connection as an expression of warm friendship which falls short of real love"—is advocated: "there is nothing in the New Testament inconsistent with it. . . . Would such a relation be incompatible with a Christian attitude towards life? I cannot see why it should be so considered"; and again:

> "As to the general relations of the sexes, Jesus has neither said nor implied anything . . . apart from the question of excess, it is possible that he may not have condemned unmarried love at all."

It is difficult to discuss this particular sort of blasphemy calmly. But the writer must surely know that in the argument just quoted he is talking, not merely blasphemy, but nonsense; it might just as reasonably be urged in support of the vilest sexual perversion—a conclusion from which, presumably, Mr. Milburn himself would shrink. But this is, perhaps, hardly more than a debating point. Where the author goes wrong is in two ways: first, in assuming that "the doctrine that sex can be sublimated in social service or other activities is not true"; secondly, in wholly misunderstanding our Lord's references to the sex question, and the Church's sexual ethic based on them. The first of these is a psychological question on which it suits Mr. Milburn to be dogmatic, but on which (to say the least) there are two opinions. His second error is more important. It is almost incredible that one who has been a Christian teacher should have, apparently, not the glimmering of an understanding of the fundamental principle—implied in Christ's reference to "the beginning of the creation," and underlying every relevant passage in the New Testament—that *sexual union implies lifelong union*. When, again, Mr. Milburn says that the Church relies upon "emphatic asseveration," and "never stops to consider" the "reason" for her code of sexual ethics, it is charitable to assume that he simply does not know what he is talking about. But he might, and ought, to have taken the trouble to learn—to learn, for example, that the marriage ceremony is the blessing of God's Church on those who have *already*, by their mutual *consent*, effected the contract. Nine-tenths of the author's supercilious criticism of traditional morality in these matters is vitiated by obvious ignorance of his opponents' elementary principles.

We have taken this lamentable volume too seriously, perhaps. We hope it will not be so taken in India, where the author was for several years a teacher in a Christian college.

CYRIL E. HUDSON.

THE CULTUS OF THE HOLY SACRAMENT

LE CULTE DU SAINT-SACREMENT. Par Cordonnier. Paris: Lethielleux. 7 francs.

At a time when many minds are turned to the subject of eucharistic devotion, it is worth while to call attention to this new book by a canon of the metropolitan chapter of Rouen. The book is not an elaborate theological treatise, and you will not find in it the historical detail and critical exactness of such experts as Dr. Stone or Edmund Bishop. For instance, we are told again that the chancels of mediæval churches were

built out of line with the nave to symbolize the drooping head on the Cross (p. 126); and on p. 127 is set out a new and fanciful idea that the rose-windows of such churches as Notre-Dame de Paris were suggested by the Monstrance. The book is pleasantly written and is full of interest, and deals with the subject so completely as to contain not only an account of the "Agape," but also of the very newest devotion to the "eucharistic Heart of Jesus," for which Benedict XV. added a mass and office to the liturgy.

The author insists that for the Christians of the early centuries eucharistic devotion was concentrated on the act of communion (pp. 73, 85), perhaps with some forgetfulness of the emphasis set on the sacrificial aspect of the rite, which is illustrated by the fact that in second-century writers, as Dr. Lock reminds us, Malachi i. 11 was "a favourite quotation." He gives a very vivid and detailed account of the immense transformation of eucharistic thought and practice which marked the thirteenth century, and he attributes it to the "new and precise" teaching of St. Thomas (p. 90), in this following the judgment of Bishop Gore and Father Freestone. In the chapter dealing with "la sainte Réserve," much emphasis is laid on the extreme simplicity and homeliness of the arrangements for it. Even when carried in procession, the Holy Sacrament was carefully concealed from view, and so "escaped completely the adoration of the people" (p. 136). The author might have noted, however, the prescription to "genuflect and adore the body of the Lord" in the statutes of Lanfranc for the Palm Sunday procession (*History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, vol. i., p. 250—Stone). "Our tabernacles . . . began by being simple eucharistic cupboards, without decoration, set down in the sacristy, hollowed out behind the altar or in the thickness of a pillar, or under the altar, as was the case at Notre-Dame de Paris, where, until 1699, the date of its demolition, the Holy Sacrament was kept under the altar called 'des Ardens,' placed behind the high altar" (p. 137; but see *Liturgica Historica*, p. 33—Bishop).

It is surprising to be reminded that visits to the Holy Sacrament were no part of normal Catholic life until after the publication of *Visites au Saint-Sacrement et à la Sainte-Vierge*, by S. Alphonsus de Liguori in 1744 (p. 271).

Cordonnier's book is reviewed in the current number of the *Revue Bénédictine* (p. 159). The reviewer writes as follows: "The doctors of the thirteenth century, by giving for the first time by their minute deductions a scientific explanation of the real presence, did not, however, create the devotion to the sacred mysteries. The eucharistic cultus, as we see it developed to-day, is only the natural continuation of the love which our first fathers had for the hidden Christ—food and drink—the joy and centre of their reunions. . . . The Christians of the first centuries had no reason to envy the development of our cultus towards the Sacred Host; their eucharistic piety, directed entirely as it was towards the feeding on the sacred victim in the course of their assemblies, was stamped with a purer reality, and was concentrated more nearly to the true end of the august mystery; and was therefore less exposed than (the eucharistic piety) of our days to the indiscreet digressions of ill-directed devotion."

J. F. Briscoe.

NOTICES

CHRISTIANITY AND ITS RIVALS*

CHRISTIANITY entered into a world which was not devoid of religion, but none of the older faiths was able to satisfy the intellect or the moral needs of mankind. When, however, Christianity spread over the heathen world, it came in contact with Greek and Oriental cults, such as the mysteries of Demeter and Dionysus, or of Mithra and Osiris, and, at a later date, the religion of Mani. Each of these cults was, at different periods of Church history, a formidable rival of the Christian faith, because it ministered partially to the same needs which were fully supplied by the gospel of Christ.

The origin of the Greek mysteries is wrapped in obscurity, but it is fairly certain that they were developed from the local cults of the earth and its fruits, personified as the Earth-mother and the Wine-God.

Their main features are well summarized by Dr. Angus as symbolism, redemption, gnosis, sacramentalism, and eschatology. The cult is, on the one hand, personal because it treats man as an individual rather than as a member of a class or nation; it is, on the other hand, cosmic because it makes man at home in the universe. The crude naturalism of the Greek mysteries was purged and refined by the mystic movement known as Orphism, which arose about the sixth century B.C.

The various stages of the mystery were very similar in all the cults. The period of probation would be occupied with confession of sins, lustrations, and acts of abstinence. The extracts from Lucian and Gregory Nazianzen, which are given by Dr. Geden, indicate the severity of the Mithraic ordeal. Such acts would fitly symbolize the devotion and self-sacrifice of the worshipper.

The ceremony of initiation must have been extraordinarily impressive. The mystics must have felt that they were lifted into a higher world in which they enjoyed intimate communion and personal union with the deity. Apuleius describes the mysteries of Isis thus: "I saw the sun shining at midnight; I worshipped face to face." The mystic formula in the Hermetic cult, "I am thou, and thou art I," reminds us of the most spiritual passages of the Fourth Gospel.

The last stage of Epopteia, or mystic vision, was attained by few. Porphyry claims to have had this experience only once or twice in his life.

Why did the mysteries spread so rapidly over the Western world? Dr. Angus points out the external conditions which favoured them, such as the breaking down of national barriers and the unification of races by Alexander the Great and the Romans. Yet the religious and ethical causes were more profound. There was a growing tendency towards monotheism, which in heathen circles took the form of syncretism, theocrasia, or henotheism (*i.e.*, the exaltation of one supreme deity in a pantheon). The moral conditions were a real sense of sin and a longing for salvation.

The mysteries failed because they could not free themselves from their primitive naturalism, nor dissociate themselves from the foreign accretions

* *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*, by S. Angus, D.D. John Murray. 15s. *The Religion of the Manichees*, by F. C. Burkitt. Cambridge University Press. 6s. *Select Passages illustrating Mithraism*, by A. S. Geden, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

of magic and astrology. That was the special danger besetting the cults of Isis and Mithra, because of their physical associations. Furthermore, the mysteries indulged the emotions and the individual instincts at the expense of the social instincts and moral obligation.

It was Christianity that reconciled the two complementary elements in human life. This point is very clearly put by Dr. Angus: "If we accept Hegel's formula of evolution—thesis, antithesis, synthesis—we might say that the Greek and Roman religions represented the thesis (social-ethical religions); the mysteries the antithesis (individual-mystic); while Judaism presented both thesis and antithesis, but laboured in vain to discover the synthesis. It was Christianity that found the synthesis" (p. 259). Above all, it was centred in a person who had really lived and worked in this world of ours.

The problem of the relations of man to God and the world is closely connected with another fundamental problem, that of the existence of evil. The religion of Mani was an attempt to explain the presence of evil in the world. It laid down two external principles—Light and Dark—which correspond to Good and Evil in the moral sphere. This dualism is fundamental and eternal. Christian dualism is relative: evil was not eternal, and may be finally destroyed. Mani taught, apparently, that evil will at last be confined within its proper sphere, the place of darkness.

Professor Burkitt examines the affinities of the teaching of Mani with that of Bardaisan and Marcion. He thinks that Mani may have borrowed his cosmology from Bardaisan, in particular the theory of a premundane Fall. Yet orthodox Christianity is committed to a doctrine of fallen spirits, including Satan. Again, Professor Burkitt compares Mani's theory of the origin of man with that of Marcion. But how far does Marcion's Demiurge correspond with the King of the Dark, who, according to Mani, begat Adam and Eve?

Mani's theory of the Primal Man, who comes forth from the Father of Greatness and the Mother of Life, seems to be quite original. It may have some affinity with the traditions recorded in the Avesta about Yima, the first man, who afterwards became the King of the Dead, and his successor, Gayomard. From the latter's seed (according to the Bundahish, which dates from A.D. 226) grew the first human pair, Mâshya and Mâshyor. But as Professor Burkitt points out, the Primal Man is entirely a superhuman being, and is equated with Ormuzd, while the Eternal Father is called Bai Zruan (p. 52).

Mani's teaching about Jesus resembles Docetism or Gnosticism. Jesus was a Divine Being, but was never born of woman, nor did he really die. Did Mani borrow this idea from Marcion, or did they both derive it from a common source?

As the mysteries distinguished the pure from the impure, who were not initiated, so Manichæism divided its adherents into two classes—the Elect and the Hearers. The Elect practised asceticism, the Hearers made confession of sins. But there was no clear distinction between moral and ritual offences. No doubt Professor Burkitt is right in saying that "Christianity is concerned with persons, Manichæism with things" (p. 60). A preoccupation with things is a mark of the lower religions.

The defects of Manichæism are obvious. Its doctrines are an amalgam of primitive physics and vague theology. It was exclusive, while Christianity, if it is truly Catholic, must be inclusive.

Christianity overcame its rivals partly, one must confess, by persecution, but partly by claiming to possess absolute truth. It is the universal religion because it proclaims that God wills all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth.

L. Patterson.

Outlines on the Book of Psalms for Meditations and Sermons. By A. G. Mortimer, D.D. Longmans. 9s.

The Psalms of David translated into English Verse. By E. H. Sugden. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

There is little doubt that the Psalter will serve the Church as a book of devotion until the end of time. Saint and scholar alike will continue to search for the spiritual riches contained within it; and the work of those who are able to declare the original form and meaning, and sometimes even the historical setting, of the Psalms will aid, not hinder, the devotional use to which they are put by Christians whose direct interest in the work of the scholar is but small. Devotion without that foundation of truth which it is the scholar's aim to supply is apt to be dull and pedestrian or unrestrainedly and dangerously imaginative.

A combined use of the two books named above may be recommended as likely to prove of considerable helpfulness. Dr. Mortimer's outlines are not marked by any special insight; but neither are they extravagant. They suggest in plain language ordinary and fairly obvious applications of certain passages in the Psalms to various aspects and stages of the spiritual life; and if those who use them will be at the pains to make use also of Mr. Sugden's excellent verse renderings of the same passages, not counting as superfluous a knowledge of what the psalmists actually wrote, and of the form in which they wrote it, they will be well rewarded. Mr. Sugden certainly undertook a task of real difficulty when he set out to translate the Psalter "into English verse in accordance with the metres and strophic structure of the Hebrew." But though it would be easy to point out lines which are something less than poetry, he has done surprisingly well, and not least in the case of the acrostic psalms, where he has preserved the original alphabetic form.

O. Hardman.

The Mystery of Belief. By A. R. Whitham. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The problem of "Good Men without Faith" drew from the Bishop of Norwich, two years ago, an interesting little book in which he suggested the importance of distinguishing between the results produced by the Light that lighteneth every man which has been ever coming into the world and the new and fuller gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon the Church after the Ascension of the Incarnate Christ. Canon Whitham has now turned his attention to the same problem. He is not surprised that the Gospel is rejected by Easterns bound by tradition and inherited prejudice, or by those whose lives are rebuked by Christian moral standards; but "What are we to say," he asks, "of the unbelief of the free, the sincere, the high-minded, the good?" This question is nowhere answered. Predestination is rejected; the Church's shortcomings are not considered to be a sufficient explanation; how, then, is the mystery of belief to be interpreted? The writer examines the subject as it appears in the Synoptists, in St. Paul, and in St. John, but does not discover, as it seems to me, any

new factor from his investigation of New Testament teaching. The mystery remains a mystery to a not inconsiderable extent. It is well, then, to turn to the practical work of declaring hindrances and helps to belief; and Canon Whitham proceeds to do this in the second half of his book, turning aside, however, for a few pages to consider all too briefly the work of the personal Hinderer of Belief.

It is disturbing to find in a chapter dealing with The Church's Interpretation of Scripture a statement on an important question of faith which altogether lacks scriptural foundation. "The Christian believer," Canon Whitham writes, "may greet in the figure of the Blessed Virgin the perfected fruit of all that had gone before in ordinance and prophecy and psalm. . . . It is surely not too much to say that the wisdom of God was justified, that His age-long revelation of Himself was vindicated, in the appearance of this one perfect type of creaturehood, in the pure body and soul of the second Eve, 'the mother of all living,' by the second birth" (p. 106). Is not this an example of a type of hindrance overlooked by the writer?

O. HARDMAN.

THE STATUTES GOVERNING THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF WINCHESTER, GIVEN BY KING CHARLES I. Edited by Arthur Worthington Goodman, B.D., and William Holden Hutton, D.D. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 15s.

Winchester, in the last half-century, has been singularly fortunate in having as Deans of the Cathedral Church historians and scholars who have rendered invaluable service to students of ecclesiastical history. Dean Kitchin, in the first volume issued by the Hampshire Record Society (in 1889), printed the Statutes of Henry VIII. for the Dean and Chapter of Winchester. Eight years later, Dean Stephens edited a second volume of cathedral documents, in which he gave a summary of the Caroline Statutes as compared with those of Henry. And now—appositely enough, since greater interest is at present being felt in our Cathedrals and their constitution than has been shown for a very long time—Dean Hutton, in collaboration with Canon Goodman, has given us the text of the Caroline Statutes, with an introduction, notes, six valuable appendices, and a careful translation.

The Henrician Statutes followed the main lines of the ordinances made for the thirteen Cathedrals of the New Foundation, with, of course, the necessary local variations. It would seem that Queen Elizabeth projected a general survey of all Cathedral Churches; and, with a view to this, Archbishop Parker drafted a set of Statutes—based for the most part on the Henrician collection—which, presumably, it was intended to enforce on all Cathedrals, at least in the Province of Canterbury; but nothing further was done in the matter. The Caroline revision is the work of Laud; and it speaks well for the advisers of Henry VIII. that Laud, having a free hand, with no hindrance from Commission or vested interests, found that so little change was necessary—that little being in the direction of greater strictness and definiteness of duty and service.

In Laud's code the nomination to canonries is handed over from the King to the Bishop of Winchester, while the right of the Crown to appoint the Dean is reaffirmed and emphasized. The interpretation of disputed points is given to the Bishop, rather than as before to the Archbishop. The relation of the Bishop to his Cathedral Church is dealt with only inci-

dentally; but this delicate question is treated by the editors in an illuminating appendix. Beyond the power of ordaining and confirming when he will, a Bishop usually has no rights in his Cathedral, except as Visitor. In Parker's draft Statutes the Bishop was empowered to preach in the Cathedral *quoties voluerit;* but Laud would seem to have deliberately rejected this provision. And even to-day, only in Peterborough Cathedral may the Bishop preach when he pleases. In this connection the question is often asked, "Who is the Ordinary?" And it is not easy to answer off-hand. But, speaking generally, in Cathedrals of the Old Foundation, the Dean and Chapter, and in the New the Dean alone, is Ordinary. Before the new Statutes for Winchester were drawn up, the Archbishop appears to have desired the body of Prebendaries, as distinct from the Dean, to send him suggestions. From their remarks (printed in Dean Stephens' *Documents*) it is clear that they wished to limit the powers and privileges of the Dean. They suggest that the Decanal power of veto should be abolished, and that no Chapter Act henceforth should stand good unless signed by the Dean and "the major part of the Chapter." To this proposal the King himself returned a decided negative; so that, in Dean Young's words, *precipiendi potestas penes Decanum.* And the Dean of Winchester to-day retains all the powers, veto included, granted to his first predecessor (the last Prior), Dean Kingsmill, in 1541. Yet, where the Henrician Statutes have the somewhat ambiguous phrase, *per Decanum aut eo absente per Vice-Decanum et Capitulum*, the ambiguity is removed by Laud, who inserts *et Capitulum* after *Decanum* also.

This question, of the relation between the Dean and the Chapter, is still a "burning" one in some Cathedrals of the New Foundation. As the late Dean Rashdall once wrote: "In some cases, partly by favour of the Statutes, partly by custom, partly by personal usurpation, the Dean is almost an autocrat; in others he has very little power except as chairman of the Chapter. There have been Deans who have destroyed portions of the fabric, or inserted a new window or a new reredos, without the consent of the Chapter; there are others whose position was well described by a new Dean, who complained, 'I thought I was going to be a rector with four curates. I find I am a curate with four rectors.' In some cases the Dean has more than one vote in Chapter; in others he has not even a casting vote. These matters should be cleared up and made fairly uniform in all Cathedrals."

Dr. Hutton has added, in Appendix VI., a long and important pronouncement on "The Cathedral To-day," which perhaps, in view of its bearing on present discussions, should have been issued as a pamphlet, since it might well be read and pondered by the ordinary Churchman as well as by the scholar. It cannot even be summarized here, but may be commended to all who wish to increase the efficiency of our Cathedrals while conserving the best features of their tradition. These Cathedrals just now are subjected to much criticism, often hostile and unfair. A Commission has been appointed to consider their position, and this may lead to legislation. The Report of the Commission of 1840 resulted in an Act which was, in Freeman's words, "a monument of hasty and ill-considered legislation." As Dr. Hutton courageously concludes, "We may hope for something much better to-day."

A. T. Bannister.

STUDENTS AND THE CHURCH. The Report of a Commission appointed by the General Committee of the Student Christian Movement. S. C. M. 1s. 6d.

This little book deals with the attitude of students to the Churches, and the policy of the Student Christian Movement in this matter. Its sections discuss, from this point of view, the Church, its worship, its thought, and its service in the world, and the relation of students to the ministry. Much of it is an appeal to students, pointing out faults and shortcomings in their attitude, but it does not hesitate to speak strongly, although not always helpfully, about the weaknesses of the Christian denominations. The book shows the extraordinary difficulty of inter-denominationalism; it seems almost impossible to prevent it from becoming, in practice, undenominationalism. The committee, for example, describe their purpose as an "attempt to provide a rationale of the Church in terms universal enough for all comers without using the specific arguments of the denominations." It goes without saying that Roman Catholics are outside the movement. This book makes one doubt whether Anglo-Catholics have any useful place in it. Student-Movementism is, increasingly, a characteristic sort of Liberal Protestantism. Its leaders are obviously aware that for many of its members it is a substitute for, not a help towards, a Church. It is one sect among the sects.

A. E. BAKER.

BERGSON'S DOCTRINE OF INTUITION. By A. A. Luce. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

Dr. Luce's Donnellan Lectures expound the philosophy of Bergson under four heads—Intuition, Free-will, Mind and Body, and Evolution. They provide a clear and brief account of what was, twenty years ago, an extraordinarily popular system of thought. Bergson himself was, of course, a miracle of lucidity, a great artist in words; but those who are not specialists in philosophy will be glad to have an account of his thinking in one small volume. We should have welcomed a little more criticism of Bergson from Dr. Luce. Modern work on the psychology of instinct has made much of what Bergson wrote about intuition singularly unsatisfying, and the arguments he used against intelligence could nearly all of them be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to intuition. A *critical* exposition of the system would still have value, however, for Bergson's insistence on quality, as distinct from quantity, on freedom, and on the real creatine elements in evolution, is a permanent contribution to present-day thinking.

A. E. BAKER.

JESUS IN THE FIRST GOSPEL. By J. A. Findlay. Hodder and Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Findlay's book deserves a warm welcome for two reasons. It deals exclusively with St. Matthew, a gospel somewhat neglected of late. And it is an example of scholarly exegesis mingled with homiletics, such as is found all too seldom. No better book could be recommended for a course of sermons or Bible classes on the First Gospel. Two very striking passages may be quoted. A lady missionary in Syria told the parable of the Two Sons to a group of women and asked which "did the will of his father." She was surprised to be told "the one who said Yes and did not go"; the reason being this: "A day's work is a little thing, but to say

No to your father's beard is a great crime." Such Oriental mentality is enough to explain the textual confusion (224). Rendel Harris' ingenious, if unconvincing, exegesis of the tribute-money is given (234). The coin had Cæsar's head on one side, a god's on the other. It belongs to Cæsar and the god—let them fight it out between them.

The scholarship is not always so happy as the exegesis. Too often Mr. Findlay uses the facile phrases of the preacher without stopping to consider whether they are justifiable. Our Lord is said to have chosen his disciples from the fisher-folk, "comparatively untainted with the vices of great cities," "radical in politics . . . conservative in religious matters . . . *with a sprinkling of publicans.*" They are contrasted with the "great towns" on the west side of the lake, containing "men of all nations" (79). What evidence is there for this antithesis?

The parable of the Wheat and Tares is made to forbid capital punishment. "If we believe that there is no possibility of change after death, it can never be right under any conceivable provocation to take away the life of the body" (116). "That the women and children should be allowed to sit down with the men [at the Feeding of the 5000] was an unheard of thing" (139). Is there any evidence for this statement? The passage "their angels do always behold . . ." is interpreted to mean "little, weak, easily-offended people who stand in the presence of the King—that is, God's purpose for them, the picture of what He intends them to become" (177). But this is mixing up interpretation of the text with twentieth-century homiletics. "Convincing evidence is now to hand that the Bride should come into Matt. 25. 1" (253) is an unsatisfactory dismissal of a difficult textual problem.

W. K. L. Clarke.

The Rev. C. T. Wood's *Life, Letters, and Religion of St. Paul* (T. and T. Clark, 8s.) is "intended primarily for young theological students"; it should also be useful in the higher forms of public schools. It bears ample evidence of the author's wide reading, though in parts it leaves an impression of "potting" and superficiality; probably this was inevitable, in view of the task Mr. Wood had set himself. But the discussion, for example, of St. Paul's Eucharistic doctrine in 1 Cor. xi. is somewhat inadequate. It is marred, moreover, by the use of the entirely misleading word "miraculous" to describe a certain conception—not the author's—of the Sacrament.

C. E. Hudson.

Sketches of Primitive Christianity. By A. Henderson. The Faith Press. 3s.

Mr. Henderson's own intimate knowledge of the topography of Rome lends an additional interest to the first part of this little book. The discussion of the "House Churches," and the light thrown on the sites of these by the latest excavations is particularly well done. Is there any evidence that the Eucharist was separated from the Agape *because of* the abuses corrected by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 17 *f.*? There is little point in quoting Chrysostom to illustrate the Didache (p. 40). The second part of the book gives English translations of extracts from Church writings from the Didache, the Apostolic Fathers, and the early Apologists down to Cyprian. These selections are well chosen, and would offer good material for Study Circles.

T. Herbert Bindley.

Atonement. By H. Maynard Smith. Macmillan. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Maynard Smith tells us that he has written this book for "educated people" who are "interested in religion, but not specialists in theology," and for "priests who minister to similar congregations." It cannot fail to be of high value to both classes. It is an attempt to set out the meaning of "Atonement" as it has actually been taught in Christian theology and experienced in Christian life. No aspect of the Christian tradition on the subject has been neglected, and some validity has been found in every metaphor by which men have tried to express what must ultimately remain inexpressible. The author points out very justly that forensic and commercial metaphors cannot rightly be contrasted with "moral" theories of the Atonement. There is nothing immoral about the law courts, the market-place, or even the battle-field as such. Only, of course, a metaphor must never be overpressed. It will be understood, then, that the book is a conservative one. But it is fresh, real, and spiritual. Its conservatism consists, not in ignoring "the modern mind," but in interrogating it and compelling it to give a better account of itself than the mere fact that it is modern. The author points out that "we are not the first generation to be confronted with a Modern Mind," and that most of the errors in the past presentation of the doctrine have arisen from an excessive desire to accommodate theological truth to contemporary thought. He even seems to part regretfully with the word "substitute," and points out a danger which besets the more popular "Representative."

He has a happy way of meeting popular criticism with a counter-criticism which is the more damaging from its simplicity. Thus he confronts the man who tells us that the Gospel doctrine of forgiveness is all to be found in the parable of the Prodigal Son with the reminder that our Lord prefaced that parable with two others—the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin. He deliberately teaches the unpopular retributory theory of punishment on the ground that sin is disobedience, and that punishment involves the moral judgment of the person who has been disobeyed. "Every healthy-minded man says, 'Serve him right,' when some cruel brute who has tortured others receives his deserts." "Punishment is not to be confused with consequences." He sometimes clears away a whole mass of objection by a happy phrase. Thus: "The Father did not send His Son because He wished Him to suffer, any more than a fond mother sent her son to the war wishing him to die."

Once or twice the desire to be vigorous leads to an overstatement. Thus he seems to imply that whatever is not contained in the Apostles' Creed is not a matter of faith. And he is surely wrong in saying that "all down the ages the Church has repeated" the words of St. John xx. 23 "to those who were ordained to be priests."

But these are very small blemishes compared with the excellence of the book as a whole.

K. D. Mackenzie.

Anici Manli Severini Boethi de Consolatione Philosophiæ Libri Quinque. Edidit Adrianus a Forti Scuto, S.T.D. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne. 12s. 6d.

If a book which is all glorious within ought to be all glorious without as well, it would be hard to name one which deserves more of editor, proof-reader, printer, and binder than the most popular work of the whole Middle Ages, the little treatise in which the "last of the Romans" has

preserved the substance of all that is best in Platonic ethics and theology, and enriched it with a poetical charm and a Christian grace of spirit which are all his own. It is matter for gratitude to everyone concerned in the production of the present edition that all parties concerned in its production have conspired to make it what an edition of such a book ought to be. The Cambridge Press has almost surpassed its own high standard in the excellence and accuracy of the printing; the binding is one of real beauty, and there is charm as well as quaintness in the frontispiece, reproduced from a Munich MS. of the thirteenth century. Above all, praise and thanks are due to the editor, the late Dr. Adrian Fortescue, and the friends who put the finishing touches to his work after his own death. Dr. Fortescue seems to me to have followed the right lines in the constitution of his text, particularly in refusing to admit "emendations" intended to correct the grammatical and metrical slips of his author. His conspectus of variations from the two or three best and most accessible printed texts is all that ought to be required in a volume meant not for the student of "late Latinity" but for thoughtful lovers of good literature; and the notes in which he embodies the results of long reading in the collection of "parallel passages" from ancient and modern literature are valuable both as throwing light on the sources of Boethius and as illustrating his far-reaching influence on later literature. Students of Dante will specially welcome the *Index Alagerianus*, which carefully collects all the passages where the greatest of modern poets refers to Boethius, or quotes or imitates the work which, as he says himself, reclaimed him from an unworthy life. I would specially commend the thorough and impartial discussion of the Preface, *de religione Boethi*, which should give the *coup de grâce* to the silly and baseless notion that Boethius was a "nominal Christian." As Dr. Fortescue says, the inferences which have been based on the absence from the work of specific reference to Christian dogma prove only one thing, that those who have made them are unaware of the very clear distinction drawn by early and mediæval Christian thinkers between truths which can and ought to be established by "philosophical" argument and truths which are specific to the Christian "revelation." There is also great force in his acute remark, in reply to the question, "Could a Christian in the hour of death have been silent about his hopes of salvation through Christ?" that, as the text itself proves, Boethius was not writing with the headsman waiting at the door. He had been condemned, but he manifestly did not expect the sentence to be enforced in its full vigour. I note one or two small slips of a kind natural in a posthumously published work, but only one or two. On p. 6, the first reference in the critical note should be to M. II., not to Pr. II.; p. 16 n. to p. 19, the reference should be Plato *Legg.* (not *Reipub.*); p. 30, the metre of II. M. I. is the familiar *scazon*, hence the last foot should have been given a — — (not ⏑ —); p. 139, n. 3, surely the Latin for "Teubner series" should be *series teubneriana!* I trust the admirable edition will delight others as much as it has delighted me.

A. E. Taylor.

Conversion: Christian and Non-Christian. A comparative and psychological study. By A. C. Underwood, D.D. George Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

In the determined effort to apply the psychological method to the religious life, the phenomenon of conversion has attracted considerable

attention. Thanks to the research work of men like Starbuck, James, Coe, and Pratt, there is now available a mass of material relating to conversion. We have been aware for some time past that conversion is not a distinctively Christian phenomenon, but one which is also found in non-Christian religions. Not the least valuable part of Dr. Underwood's work is the investigation of the phenomena which the non-Christian religions afford. The field of investigation is thus considerably widened. Our author draws very fully upon the religions of India, having had the advantage of several years' residence in India, and so having been able in some degree to put himself *en rapport* with the psychological climate of the country. Another striking feature of Dr. Underwood's treatment of his theme is the attempt he makes to widen the bases of induction by combining the comparative and the psychological method. The supremacy of Christian conversion is not an assumption, but the conclusion of a most searching consideration of conversion in its comparative aspects.

The Professor has divided his work into two main parts. In Part I. is set out at some length the evidence for the fact of conversion in the New Testament and in the non-Christian religions. Part II. is mainly psychological, and treats of such topics as conversion and adolescence; experiences preceding conversion; types of conversion; the immediate accompaniments of conversion, and so on.

A chapter on the psychological mechanism of conversion forces us to raise the question which sooner or later must be raised in any psychological treatment of the phenomena of religious experience—viz., do these psychological "explanations" really undermine the religious view of conversion? The larger issue, of course, is that of ultimate objective validity. Dr. Underwood, as himself a minister of the Gospel of Christ, is keenly alive to the vital issues at stake, but he bravely faces the worst that can be said on behalf of a purely atheistic conclusion, and sums up in favour of the Christian theist. The psychological mechanism of conversion, however fully grasped, is not identical with the psychology of conversion. Men and women are not converted by a rearrangement of their complexes. We may conclude that the psychological mechanism of conversion makes the self-surrender which we find in all conversions possible. Moreover, to correlate the psychological mechanism of conversion with the surrender factor in it is not inconsistent with a belief in human freedom, nor does it rule out the possibility of the bestowal of divine grace. Dr. Underwood wisely and truly reminds us that God is a god of order even in the affairs of the spirit, and it is not the less He who has done a thing when we have come to understand how He has done it. We may quite well hold that what divine grace does in conversion is to come to the will with healing and enabling power, so as to make surrender to God possible.

The problem of the ultimate causation of conversion cannot be solved by psychology. It is not necessary to think of divine grace as independent of the laws of the mind in its operations. The laws which govern the working of the human mind, Dr. Underwood points out, are just as much God's laws as those by which the planets revolve in their orbits. It is surely a mistake to see the action of God only in the unusual and catastrophic, and to refuse to see it in ordered processes. Psychology can only demonstrate how God works; but it is not less God who has done a thing when we have come to understand how He has done it.

Again, if the term "suggestion" is suspect as carrying with it the impli-

cation of self-deception, we need not be unduly alarmed when we remind ourselves, in the words of that wise student of the religious life, Dr. Rufus M. Jones, that the term "suggestion" "may be only another way of saying that God and man are conjunct, and that in the deeps of the soul, beyond our power of knowing how, divine suggestions come to human consciousness." And as to those seeming reservoirs of energy which are stored up in the soul of man, Dr. Underwood is on sound ground when he asserts that psychology can do no more than describe their presence and their manifestations. The question of their *ultimate* source lies outside its province.

There is a most instructive chapter on conversion during revivals, which will repay the careful study not only of the student of the psychology of religious experience, but also the preacher and the teacher.

Dr. Underwood has given us what is probably the most complete and exhaustive treatment of conversion that has yet appeared.

H. Maurice Relton.

The Life and Work of St. Wilfrid of Ripon, Apostle of Sussex. By J. S. Fletcher. Chichester: E. H. Thompson.

Richard Baxter, Puritan and Mystic. By A. R. Ladell. S.P.C.K. 5s.

Foure Birds of Noah's Arke. By Thomas Dekker. Edited by F. P. Wilson. Basil Blackwell.

Mr. Fletcher has given us an excellent and interesting short biography of St. Wilfrid, the great bishop whose work in persuading Northumbria to accept the Roman Easter led to the union of the various missions to the English into a single united Church of England, and who converted the people of Sussex, the last English kingdom to remain heathen. But by comparing the work of St. Wilfrid to modern attempts at reunion with Rome, he has, perhaps unconsciously, brought into confusion an issue which it is important should be clearly understood. The issue between Rome and England to-day is a question of doctrine; in the days of St. Wilfrid it was only a question of the date of Easter. Between the Roman and Celtic churches there was no doctrinal difference, nor any formal breach of communion. To say, as Mr. Fletcher does, that St. Wilfrid "united what had been until then a merely local church with the great Church of the Apostles" is misleading. Nor did the English Church accept the "papal supremacy" in consequence of anything St. Wilfrid did. The question decided at Whitby was simply this: should Northumbria continue to use the old-fashioned kalendar of Iona, or adopt the kalendar used everywhere outside the British Isles? St. Wilfrid's appeal to Rome did not mean more, at that period, than Bishop Weston's appeal to Canterbury about Kikuyu.

Mr. Ladell's account of Richard Baxter, the Puritan saint, throws much light on the difficulties of men who, in time of civil war, cannot throw themselves whole-heartedly into either camp. We wish the author could have given us a chapter on the social background of the period.

It is very difficult for the modern Englishman to picture to himself Stuart England, aristocratic but no longer feudal and not yet Whig, with Scotland and Ireland foreign countries, yet already subject to the English King. The religious problems, too, are so familiar and yet so strange. It was then the Anglo-Catholics (if one may call them so) who insisted that the "law of the land must be obeyed," and the Puritans who demanded Prayer-Book Revision. Mr. Ladell shows that Baxter was a

mystic, who "had no conception of the Church as a society, or even as a family; his vision was focussed on the soul, naked and responsible before its Creator." It is not surprising that he was out of sympathy both with Laud and with the rigid Presbyterians. One doubts if the Sacraments meant much to him; apparently he never proceeded beyond the diaconate, which he may have regarded as sufficient "ordination" for all purposes. In quieter times his position would not have caused any difficulty, but he was forced into becoming a party leader, and felt it his duty to refuse to conform to the Restoration settlement, though he never formally seceded from the Church. The disgusting story of his trial before Judge Jeffrey is a disgrace to both Church and State, and shows what the men of 1689 were up against.

On the other hand, as Mr. Ladell says, "there never could be either mutual understanding or any form of agreement between those who stood for Puritanism and those who stood for Anglo-Catholicism." It is useless to mourn over the exclusion of the Puritans; they could not accept even the broad platform of the English Church, and their departure was inevitable. There must always be room in the Church for the Puritan and the mystic, if he can accept the sacramental system; but if he cannot, there is nothing for it but separation. Mr. Ladell does not mention Baxter's beautiful hymn, "He wants not friends that hath Thy love" (E. H., 401)—one of the finest descriptions of the Communion of Saints that we have.

We must protest against Mr. Ladell's attribution of "Machiavellian principles" to King Charles I. (p. 69). Machiavellian is just what King Charles was not. He had two principles, from which he never swerved, because they were both part of his religion: to maintain his right of personal government and episcopacy, both of which were, in his eyes, a Divine trust. A Charles II. or Henri IV. would have surrendered these, and saved his crown; but King Charles was not a statesman, he was a martyr.

The *Foure Birds of Noah's Arke* is a charming book of prayers written in the quaintest English by the Elizabethan poet, Dekker. The four birds are the dove, the eagle, the "pellican," and the phœnix, and the prayers are grouped under those heads. They range from a prayer for the King ("Plant a guard of Angels about his bed, and a troupe of Saints about his throne") to a "Prayer for men that worke in dangerous works, as Coale-pits, etc.," who are to say, "So neere the houre of danger must I this day dwell, that on my knees I entreate thee to keepe side by side with me in my goings." The book ends thus: "Make us, O Lord, to be Doves in our lives, innocent and without gall: to be Eagles in our meditations, cleere-sighted, and bold to look upon thee: to be Pellicans in our workes, charitable and religious; and last, to be as the Phœnix in our deaths, that after we have slept in our graves, wee may rise up in joy with thy Son, ascend with him into heaven, and there at thy hands receive an immortal crowne of everlasting glory. Amen."

C. B. Moss.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.